

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IT'S TIME TO END IRRIGATION
SUBSIDIES FOR SURPLUS CROPS

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me as original cosponsors of a bill I plan to introduce shortly to stop the Government from granting massive irrigation subsidies to grow more surplus crops when we are already paying farmers not to grow the very same crops. I include the full text of the bill and a summary at the end of this statement.

The concept at the heart of the bill has previously received broad support in the House. Earlier this year, I offered an amendment to apply this concept to the Garrison Diversion project bill—H.R. 1116, April 23. Although the amendment did not pass, the surprisingly narrow margin of that vote—203-199—showed that there is broad feeling in the House that the time has come to stop this wasteful conflict between agricultural and irrigation policies. The House adopted a similar amendment of mine in 1982 during debate on the Reclamation Reform Act. Although that amendment was weakened in conference to a study of the problem, the study confirmed the problem and supported the solution in my bill.

The bill I will introduce shortly simply provides that, if an irrigator choose to use the water he receives from a federally subsidized irrigation project to grow more of crops that are already in surplus, then he must pay the full cost to the taxpayers of providing him that water.

BUDGET DEFICITS AND AG SURPLUSES

Mr. Speaker, the old saying that, "If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem," seems especially appropriate on this issue. Two of the biggest problems facing Congress this month are the budget deficit and the surplus of agricultural commodities. The deficit is such a big problem that are cutting funding for needed programs.

Second, we are awash in a world of surplus agricultural commodities. As a member of the Agriculture Committee who has wrestled with the farm problem, I can assure you that no serious agricultural analyst believes that the surpluses will disappear soon. Any action based on that notion is pure speculation. World agricultural production is increasing so rapidly that it is extremely difficult for the United States to sell its commodities on the glutted world markets. The United States spends millions just to store surplus commodities, and we pay our farmers more and more not to grow these crops in the first place. In fact, under the farm bill's long-term conservation reserve, we will pay farmers to take 40 million acres out of production over the next 5 years, in addition

to millions of acres of annual set-asides that will take additional land out of production.

IRRIGATION SUBSIDIES

Irrigation subsidies have outlived their original purpose. The Reclamation Act of 1902 set the policy of making irrigated water available to provide opportunities to settle and develop arid western lands. One goal of this 1902 legislation was that water rates be set so that Federal costs to construct projects could be recovered in payments from the farmers who received the water. Over the years, water rates were adjusted to permit small subsidies to the smallest farmers. Successive changes in the original law resulted finally in big western railroads and multinational oil companies receiving millions of dollars in water subsidies on giant farms. In 1981, the U.S. General Accounting Office concluded that the original goals of the 1902 Reclamation Act had been achieved, and recommended that our irrigation policies should now be reevaluated in the light of current economic and social conditions.

Almost half of lands irrigated with federally subsidized water have been planted with surplus crops.

In 1985, the highly respected Natural Resources Defense Council [NRDC] published an authoritative study documenting the enormous subsidies involved, including many subsidies not authorized by Congress, and the deep environmental problems caused by continued irrigation development. The NRDC concluded that the solution was to let the market work:

The most critical need is to force water users to recognize the true costs of water. This can only be done by removing a major portion of the subsidy. If costs rise, water users will be forced to consider better ways of using water, and will have few incentives to exert political pressures for additional projects.

If this sounds like the Reagan administration talking, it should. In March of this year, the U.S. Department of the Interior wrote Congress in regard to reauthorization of the small irrigation projects loan program that:

We believe that the time has arrived to remove the Small Reclamation Projects Act program from Federal interest subsidies. In these times of Federal budget exigencies and large surpluses of agricultural production, we can no longer afford to grant interest-free Small Reclamation Projects Act loans for irrigation-related purposes.

The economics of irrigation subsidies are indefensible. For example, the Garrison project will invest an average of \$5,000 in order to irrigate 1 acre in the project, but this will increase the market value of an acre of land by an average of only \$400. None of us would invest our own money so poorly, why should we ask the taxpayers to do so?

THE RECLAMATION REFORM ACT OF 1982

In recent decades, recognizing that our reclamation policies must be brought into line

with today's budget and agricultural realities, Congress has sought to modify reclamation policy in order to end the conflict between reclamation and agricultural policies. Many authorizations for particular irrigation projects have contained prohibitions against using the projects' water on surplus crops. Unfortunately, flat prohibitions such as this did not work as intended because of loopholes and a lack of will on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation to enforce them.

Congress again tried to address the issue during debate on the comprehensive Reclamation Reform Act of 1982. The House adopted a tough amendment of mine which would have flatly prohibited the delivery of irrigation water to grow surplus crops. This amendment was watered down in conference to a study. But this study, "Production of Surplus Crops on Irrigated Land Served by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation," USDA Economic Research Service, February 1984—found that a full 45 percent of lands throughout the West that were irrigated with subsidized Bureau water were planted with surplus crops—59 percent of subsidized irrigated acres in California. The study agreed with the advantages of the solution embodied in the bill I will introduce shortly:

Reclamation and commodity program goals conflict * * *. Requiring farmers who use U.S. Bureau of Reclamation water to pay full cost for water used on program crops as long as the crop is declared in surplus represents a policy strategy to eliminate one of the subsidies—the subsidy provided through the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation program. Under this plan, Bureau-served farmers would be placed on a comparable basis with other program crop producers in the Nation. National production efficiency would be expected to improve as production would move towards areas of comparative advantage. Program costs would be reduced due to lower production and higher prices; administrative costs would increase somewhat to assure compliance. The use of full-cost pricing for project water on farms in excess of 960 acres already is a feature of Public Law 97-293—Reclamation Reform Act of 1982.

As the study notes, the 1982 Reclamation Reform Act made some reforms. First, it clearly defined the term "full cost" to conclude all of a project's capital construction costs, its operation/maintenance costs and the interest cost of the Government's borrowing to build the project. My new bill references this definition of "full cost."

Second, the 1982 law required beneficiaries to repay the full costs of new irrigation projects, except for categories of beneficiaries deemed more deserving of continued subsidies, such as small family farmers. My bill simply says that any farmers who choose to work against the goals of our farm programs should not qualify as a group deserving subsidies. This is a consistent application of the full

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

cost repayment standard that exists in current law.

Requiring full cost repayment for water used to grow surplus crops is a better way to approach the problem than past proposals to absolutely prohibit delivery of water for surplus crops. The absolute prohibition was unenforceable and punitive because it stated that "no water . . . shall be delivered" to grow surplus crops on newly irrigated lands. In order to enforce this provision, the Secretary of the Interior would have to actually turn off the water. As has been pointed out in hearings before the House Interior Subcommittee on Water and Power, the pressures against turning off the water are so strong that the concept doesn't work.

The concept of charging full cost for water used on surplus crops is fair. It is fair to the irrigator who can decide whether he is willing to pay full cost for the water if he chooses to use it for no productive purpose. Second, it is fair to other farmers who do not receive irrigation subsidies. Currently, those farmers suffer the consequences of a glutted market and must compete against farmers who receive subsidized water. Third, it is fair to the taxpayers, because they shouldn't have to pay for both farm programs and irrigation subsidies.

SUMMARY

First. Generally, the bill requires irrigators signing new or amended irrigation contracts to agree to pay full cost for any water they use on surplus crops. The bill would only apply to those seeking new or expanded irrigation benefits.

Second. The bill requires repayment to the government of the full cost of providing the water. Full cost is defined in the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982, the most recent comprehensive congressional revision of Federal irrigation policy. Large farmers and others who do not qualify for subsidies must currently pay this same full cost rate.

Third. A crop is defined as "surplus" if there is in effect a Federal program to pay farmers to reduce production of that crop. Currently, such programs exist for feed grains—including corn—rice, tobacco, wheat, cotton, and peanuts. A similar soybean program may be started within a few years. The agricultural marketing order crops are not covered by this bill.

Fourth. For purposes of the bill, it is irrelevant whether an individual farmer participates in farm programs. He is still required to pay full cost for water he uses to worsen the problem of surplus crops.

Fifth. Payment is calculated annually. When the Bureau of Reclamation is making its annual calculation of repayment obligations and water rates, the bill would simply require that the Bureau charge full cost for whatever percentage of water is obtained each year for irrigating surplus crops. Currently, complex Bureau calculations already take into account full cost charges for certain farmers.

Sixth. The Secretary of the Interior would announce the amount of next year's full cost charges on a project by July 1 of each year so that irrigators would have time to plan what crops to plant next spring.

The full text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That section 9 of the Reclamation Projects Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) Any contract entered into under authority of this section or any other provision of Federal reclamation law shall require that the organization agree by contract with the Secretary to pay full cost for the delivery of water used in the production of any agricultural commodity if there is in effect for any marketing year for such commodity a program to limit production of such commodity, as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(2) The Secretary shall announce the amount of the full cost payment for the succeeding year on or before July 1 of each year.

"(3) As used in this subsection—
"(A) the term 'agricultural commodity' means feed grains, cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, or wheat or any other agricultural commodity for which there is in effect a similar crop reduction program; and
"(B) the term 'full cost' shall have the meaning given in paragraph (3) of section 202 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390bb(3)).

"(4) Paragraph (1) shall apply to any contract entered into or amended after the date of enactment of this subsection."

NARCOTICS EPIDEMIC

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the narcotics epidemic assumes many frightening faces in south Florida. Nationally, the problems of enforcement, education, and rehabilitation are enormous. In Florida, they are compounded by the involvement of illegal immigrants in the drug network.

On July 30, 1986, the Florida Sheriffs Association adopted a resolution which illuminates the connection between illegal immigrants and illicit drugs. In light of the sheriffs' intimate involvement in the narcotics war, their words merit thorough consideration.

FLORIDA SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION
86-1—JULY 30, 1986

Whereas, the State of Florida is overburdened with illegal immigrants, often in a refugee status; and

Whereas, these foreign nationals are all too often engaged in the manufacture, distribution and sale of illicit drugs; and

Whereas, these foreign nationals all too often are able to bond out of jail after arrest on these drug activities, assume new identities, and go forth to commit new crimes, thus evading conviction in our courts; and

Whereas, the current policy of the Immigration & Naturalization Service (INS) is to require a felony conviction as a condition precedent to deportation, it is readily apparent that the citizens of this state are being victimized again and again by the same non-citizen criminals—especially through the ever-increasing sale of "crack" cocaine;

Now therefore be it unanimously Resolved, by the members of the Florida Sheriffs Association that in order to protect our law-abiding citizens, especially our youth, from this recurrent criminal behavior, the

INS adopt a policy of no bond immigration holds in secure facilities for all such criminals until prosecution and/or deportation is accomplished.

Whether or not the sheriff's resolution meets with universal agreement, I believe we should heed the old adage: where there's smoke there's fire.

My investigations into the communication and cooperation between sheriffs and the INS are by no means complete. To date, the information I have received is often confusing, conflicting, and complex. The variety of answers, alone, indicates to me an enormous need for improved communication.

The drug bill comes before the House this week. Most likely, the immigration bill will soon follow. New drug laws and new immigration laws are not a cure-all. They will be effective only if they are enforced.

One of the fundamental aids to enforcement must be communication. If a far-reaching effort among sheriffs and INS officials is made, I feel confident that we will have won a early victory in the war on drugs. Above all, public officials must operate behind a unified front.

REPRESENTATIVE HAMILTON'S PRESCRIPTION FOR HANDCUFFING THE PRESIDENT

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which Representative HAMILTON offered to the Intelligence Authorization Act for 1987 is a case of the Congress improperly meddling in a realm of government best left to the executive. The notion that Congress should debate in the open all that the President desires to do covertly is nothing less than a prescription for handcuffing the Executive. Whatever political party the Executive might represent, he is the Nation's highest elected official, and there are and will be things he is required to do covertly to defend the national security and to advance the national purpose.

While on this matter I cannot agree with the gentleman from Indiana, I have learned a lesson from Alexander Hamilton, the founder who wrote of the treaty-making something which applies to intelligence matters generally. The italics are Hamilton's own, and the political body he is discussing is this very House of Representatives: " . . . secrecy, and dispatch are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous."

I wish to add for the consideration of my colleagues the text of an excellent essay which Hon. HENRY HYDE published in the Washington Times on August 13 of this year. Titled "Distaste for Covert Actions," it sets forth Mr. HYDE's reasons, which resemble my own, for disagreeing with the Hamilton amendment.

DISTASTE FOR COVERT ACTIONS

(By Henry Hyde)

It has been said that Queen Victoria, in rejecting the idea of submarine warfare, called it a decidedly un-British way of fight-

ing. True or not, there are those in positions of power in Congress who express the same fastidiousness about U.S. covert actions. Among those appearing to hold such a view is Democratic Rep. Lee Hamilton of Indiana, the respected chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Earlier this year, what amounts to a new anti-covert action doctrine was enunciated by Mr. Hamilton. Specifically, the Hamilton Doctrine says that any "hotly debated" aspect of U.S. foreign policy with sensitive, covert intelligence ramifications must be openly acknowledged, publicly debated, and approved by Congress before any money can be provided in support of that policy.

More recently, Mr. Hamilton has translated his doctrine into legislation that is designed to sabotage the Reagan Doctrine of aiding anti-Communist resistance forces around the world. This latest Hamilton proposal, which has very damaging foreign-policy implications, is incorporated in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (H.R. 4759), slated to be considered by the full House soon.

The first test case of the Hamilton Doctrine will be Angola. In essence, the Hamilton legislation stipulates that no U.S. covert military or paramilitary assistance to Jonas Savimbi's National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) can be furnished unless such aid is publicly acknowledged and publicly approved by Congress. In other words, this is a clear attempt to reverse Congress's decision last year to repeal the 10-year-old Clark Amendment, which prohibited U.S. covert paramilitary activities in Angola.

What particularly disturbs me, as one who shares membership with Mr. Hamilton on the House intelligence committee, is that his doctrine represents a threat, ultimately, to all covert action, not just to what might be undertaken in Angola.

Debating an issue of this nature in open session empties the congressional intelligence oversight process of any real meaning.

And who makes the determination as to what is "hotly debated"—the media, certain senators and representatives, or the American public, which may have an entirely different point of view?

Questions concerning U.S. support of paramilitary operations in any part of the world should be discussed secretly within the confines of Congress's two intelligence committees. That is why those panels were established.

Members of Congress should realize there are instances when our foreign policy must be circumspect, and indeed, even appear ambiguous, to be fruitful. Angola is a case in point. As State Department officials have indicated, a public debate on whether we should have a military support relationship with UNITA might reveal specific, sensitive information to our adversaries.

The Libyan bombing episode of last April demonstrated that the president must have a covert foreign policy option that lies somewhere between no action and sending the Marines or American bombers. The Hamilton Doctrine would preclude that. Moreover, it jeopardize clandestine cooperation from other countries who feel that they cannot afford to be identified publicly as backing U.S. foreign-policy objectives and activities.

Some argue that once the general nature of a covert operation is disclosed, there is no sense in trying to protect it further. They fail to recognize, however, that as long as certain aspects of that operation are secret, the other side is kept guessing as to appropriate countermeasures. Dispelling uncertainties by congressional corroboration of information available elsewhere upgrades its probable accuracy, and thus aids our foes.

In addition, the nature of diplomacy is such that a government may diplomatically ignore rumors or even public non-official discussion of the existence of a covert action, but official acknowledgment requires a strong diplomatic response or more.

Furthermore, justifying, as Mr. Hamilton does, open congressional debate of a particular covert action, because of what he views as ostensible administration confirmation of that activity, is really a ruse for torpedoing any such operation. We should bear in mind that the president does not hold a press conference each time he notifies the House and Senate intelligence committees of a new covert plan or activity.

Admittedly, there have been some unfortunate public discussions by administration and congressional officials regarding some covert operations, but frequently these slips have occurred after someone privy to that action has apparently leaked the details. That's how, for example, the past U.S. program for aiding Nicaraguan resistance forces ultimately became the most overt covert program in American history. Although no excuse for these unauthorized revelations, such disclosures make it virtually impossible for the president plausibly to ignore or deny U.S. involvement.

In short, we must protect all covert activities. Congress cannot selectively pick and choose those we want to keep secret. Terminating those we don't like by leaks, or by public congressional debate—as envisioned by Mr. Hamilton—will eventually destroy this nation's covert-action capability. Removing a foreign-policy card from the president's hand that has been played by chief executives since the days of George Washington seriously imperils this nation's security.

As we have painfully learned in our war against terrorism, we cannot go it alone in this increasingly interdependent world. We cannot expect allies to engage in joint covert operations that may be disclosed. If we cannot guarantee confidentiality to otherwise cooperative third countries, we end up perilously isolated.

Mr. Hamilton's initiative is dangerous for everyone concerned. The Hamilton Doctrine sends a signal to the Soviet Union and to our friends alike that eventually all United States covert actions worldwide could be exposed because the U.S. Congress is an unpredictable and undependable "wild card" in the intelligence process.

Such a turn of events would irreparably damage our ability to confront Soviet expansionism, not only in Africa, but in Asia, the Middle East and Latin America, with all that ominously portends for the future of the Free World.

STATUS OF THE GENEVA ARMS CONTROL TALKS: OPENING OF ROUND VI SET TO BEGIN SEPTEMBER 18

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States-Soviet arms control negotiations are scheduled to resume in Geneva on September 18.

After the close of Round V on June 27, President Reagan responded to the Soviet proposal in a letter to General Secretary Gorbachev. The contents of this letter have not been officially disclosed.

Following my statement is a chart containing the United States and Soviet positions on arms control issues. This update, current as of August 1986, is based on the best available information from unclassified sources.

My last statement on the "Status of the Geneva Arms Control Talks: Round V" appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14 and 17, 1986. Since that time developments have occurred in the United States and Soviet positions which are highlighted as follows:

First, in the strategic area, the Soviets have suggested procedures for verification of mobile missiles, including designating deployment areas, monitoring missiles as they leave the factory, and marking rail-mobile ICBM's to distinguish them from other rail cars.

Second, in the space and defense area, the United States has proposed to forego SDI deployment for 7½ years while continuing to research, develop and test SDI technologies as permitted by the ABM Treaty. Interpretation of the ABM Treaty is not specified. If after 5 years, defenses prove feasible, the United States and the Soviet Union will undertake negotiations on managing the transition to a defense-dominated deterrent. Absent agreement 2 years after discussions begin, each side will be free to deploy defenses unilaterally on 6 months' notice. The United States declares its willingness to share the benefits of the SDI system with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union also proposes to stop work on the Krasnoyarsk radar if the United States stops work on two radars in England and Greenland.

Also, in the space and defense area, the Soviet Union maintains its pledge not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years and limits work on SDI-type strategic defenses to laboratory research.

At the close of the last round, both sides had proposed zero long range INF systems in Europe. The Soviets proposed that SS-20's in Asia would not be increased and would be reduced contingent upon reduction of U.S. nuclear weapon systems on ships and aircraft in Asia. The United States further proposed no constraints on British and French systems while the Soviet Union proposed that Great Britain and France pledge not to build up their nuclear arsenals.

The main provisions of the United States and Soviet proposals in the strategic area in-

clude the United States proposed ceiling of 1,250-1,450 on ICBM and SLBM launchers (with freedom to mix) and a ceiling of 350 on strategic bombers. The Soviets have proposed a ceiling of 1,600 on ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers.

The U.S. position on warhead limits calls for a ceiling of 4,500 with no more than 3,000

warheads on ICBM's. The Soviets call for a ceiling of 8,000 nuclear charges, that is, warheads, gravity bombs, and long-range cruise missiles on strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, with no more than 4,800 nuclear charges on any one type of system (ICBM's, SLBM's, or bombers).

The Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on Arms Control will continue to monitor the progress of the Geneva arms control talks and will provide to our colleagues up-to-date analyses and comparisons of the United States and Soviet arms control proposals tabled at Geneva and related developments.

STATUS OF GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS, AUGUST 1986

Category	United States proposal	Soviet proposal
I. STRATEGIC ^{1 2}		
Linkage	Agreement on strategic arms should not be dependent on a resolution on space and strategic defense issues.	Strategic arms reductions are linked to agreement on space and defensive weapons.
Delivery vehicles:		
Strategic ballistic missile launchers	1250-1450—ICBM and SLBM launchers, with freedom to mix	1,600—ICBM, SLBM's, and heavy bombers. The June 1986 proposal drops the earlier Soviet insistence that U.S. INF missiles and aircraft be included in the ceiling on strategic arms. The proposal reportedly does, however, call for a freeze on these systems.
Strategic bombers	350—B-52, B-1, Stealth, Bison, Bear, Blackjack, Backfire	Do
Weapons:		
Strategic missile RV's	4,500—with no more than 3,000 on ICBM's	8,000—"nuclear charges"—i.e., warheads, gravity bombs, SRAMs, long range cruise missiles (those with a range >600km)—on strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. No more than 4,800 nuclear charges on any one type of system (ICBM's, SLBM's, or bombers).
Weapons other than ALCM's on strategic bombers	Not limited	Do
Long-range ALCM's	1,500—Ceiling contingent on Soviet acceptance of RV and throwweight limits	Do
Long-range SLCM's	Not limited	Ban on long-range SLCM's on surface ships.
Throwweight	6 million lbs	No direct limitation.
New systems	This is a ban on mobile missiles and new or modernized heavy missiles. Ban on Midgetman. Ban on SS-24, SS-25, and SS-18 follow-on.	Ban on new types of strategic delivery systems, with "new type" reportedly intended to apply to systems not flight tested as of an unspecified date.
Verification		Procedures suggested for verification of mobile missiles, including designating deployment areas, monitoring missiles as they leave the factory, marking rail-mobile ICBM's to distinguish them from other rail cars.
II. INF ^{3 4}		
Europe:		
United States and Soviet long-range INF (LRINF) missiles	0 P-2's, 0 GLCM's, 0 SS-20's—Global ban on all LRINF missiles. Elimination phased over 3 years, with reduction of 140 launchers in the first year, to 70 in the second, and 0 in the third. Missiles and launchers withdrawn would be destroyed. During the reduction period, the United States would reserve the right to possess a number of LRINF systems equal to the Soviet LRINF total in Europe and Asia. The excess over allowed deployments in Europe would be retained in the continental United States.	0 P-2's, 0 GLCM's, 0 SS-20's to the west of the 80° longitude—U.S. undertakes not to transfer medium-range strategic missiles to other countries. Missiles withdrawn would be destroyed.
British and French INF systems	No constraints.	Great Britain and France pledge not to build up their nuclear arsenals. Whether modernization would be permitted remains unclear.
Shorter range INF missiles	Ceiling on SRINF, either at current Soviet levels, or at levels both sides had on January 1, 1982.	No limit formally proposed, but stated willingness to withdraw SRINF if U.S. P-2's and GLCM's are eliminated.
Asia: LRINF missile launchers	0 SS-20's—Reductions phased over 3 years, in proportions to SS-20 reductions in Europe.	SS-20's in Asia would not be increased. Reductions said to be contingent on reduction of the threat posed by U.S. nuclear weapon systems on ships and aircraft in Asia.
Verification	Count each side's missiles to set totals from which reductions would be made; designate deployment areas; establish procedures for monitoring production and destruction, possibly involving some on-site inspection.	Expressed willingness to agree to appropriate verification measures, including on-site inspection.
III. Space and Defense ^{5 6}		
Strategic defenses	Foreswear SDI deployment for 7½ years while continuing research, development, and testing as permitted by the ABM Treaty. Interpretation of the ABM Treaty left unspecified. If after 5 years, defenses prove feasible, the U.S. and U.S.S.R. will undertake negotiations on managing the transition to a defense-dominated deterrent. Absent agreement 2 years after discussions begin, each side will be free to deploy defenses unilaterally on 6 months' notice. The U.S. declares its willingness to "share the benefits of the [SDI] system" with the U.S.S.R.	Neutral pledge not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years; limit work on SDI-type strategic defenses to laboratory research, "that is, the threshold which the United States has already approached." Stop work on Krasnoyarsk radar if United States stops work on two radars in England and Greenland.
Antisatellite weapons (ASAT's)	An ASAT agreement is not in U.S. national security at this time.	United States should join the ASAT testing moratorium that the Soviet Union is currently observing.
Verification	"Open laboratories" arrangement for exchanged briefings on each other's strategic defense programs, and for reciprocal visits to laboratories where the research is being conducted.	Expressed willingness to agree to necessary verification measures.

¹ The U.S. proposal is discussed in Nitze, Paul H. Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms. Remarks Before a symposium at the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute on March 13, 1986, Department of State Bulletin, v. 86 May 1986, p. 50-53.

² The latest Soviet offer was reportedly put on the table on June 11, 1986. See, Gordon, Michael, U.S. Arms Officials Finding Problems in Offer by Soviet, New York Times, June 17, 1986, p. A1, A6; and Oberdorfer, Don, and Walter Pincus, Response to New Soviet Arms Offer Unlikely During Geneva Session, Washington Post, June 18, 1986, p. A30. In a speech before the CPSU Central Committee on June 16, General Secretary Gorbachev acknowledged the new proposal and provided sketchy information that confirmed some of the reports that had appeared in the Western press. The proposal was subsequently discussed in the Soviet press. See, for example, New Times, July 21, 1986, in FBIS Soviet Union Daily Report, July 22, 1986, p. AA3-AA6. On verification see Gordon, Michael, Moscow Said to Signal Willingness to Work on Arms Pack Verification, New York Times, June 22, 1986, sec. 1, p. 14.

³ The U.S. proposal described here was advanced in February 1986, in response to the Soviet proposal of January 15. Ambassador Paul Nitze presented an outline of the U.S. proposal in Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms, Remarks Before a Symposium at the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute on March 13, 1986, Department of State Bulletin, v. 86, May 1986, p. 50-53. In addition to the proposals to eliminate LRINF missiles, an earlier U.S. offer to freeze INF launchers at 140 reportedly remains on the table in Geneva. See, Gordon, Michael, Arms Talks Adjourn With No Gains, New York Times, March 6, 1986, p. A3. The U.S. proposal on INF verification is reported in Oberdorfer, Don and Walter Pincus, U.S. Offers Nuclear Inspection Plan, Washington Post, March 15, 1986, p. A1, A18.

⁴ The Soviet proposal to eliminate LRINF in Europe, first presented to Gorbachev on January 15, 1986, was formalized in a draft treaty introduced in Geneva on May 15. Source for the Soviet proposal include: Gorbachev statement in Pravda, January 16, 1986, FBIS Soviet Union Daily Report, January 16, 1986, p. AA1-AA9; press conference in Moscow, FBIS Soviet Union Daily Report, January 21, 1986, p. AA1-AA13. On SS-20's in Asia, see General Secretary Gorbachev's speech before the CPSU Central Committee, June 16, 1986, and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's comments in Tass, January 16, 1986, FBIS Soviet Union Daily Report, January 17, 1986, p. C2. On SRINF, see Shevardnadze's speech before the CPSU Party Congress, FBIS Soviet Union Daily Report National Affairs Supplement, March 3, 1986, p. 017. On British and French systems, see DeYoung, Karen, Soviets Modify Stance on British, French Arms, Washington Post, July 17, 1986, p. A27.

⁵ U.S. position on space defensive systems was advanced in a letter from President Reagan to General Secretary Gorbachev. The letter remains confidential, but the press has outlined its contents as described by unnamed Administration sources. See, Oberdorfer, Don, Reagan Called Ready to Make Deal on Defensive Arms, Washington Post, August 3, 1986, p. A1-A20. The U.S. position on ASAT's is expressed in U.S. Policy on ASAT Arms Control, Communication from the President of the United States, House Doc. 98-197, Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1984.

⁶ Speech by General Gorbachev before the CPSU Central Committee, June 16, 1986. Gorbachev discussed verification in his statement on January 15, 1986, published in Pravda, January 16, 1986, FBIS Soviet Union Daily Report January 16, 1986, p. AA1-AA9.

FOR A DEFENSE THAT WORKS,
NOT WASTE

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon has darted out of the blocks to dismiss many critics of its current policies as arm-chair intellectuals who know a lot about military reform and little about combat.

But it's a bit tougher to dismiss the critique of our military policy by a former Marine colonel with combat experience. Col. David Evans, USMC retired, recently levelled his sights on seven deadly flaws of our military system. These were detailed in an article reprinted in the Grand Forks Herald of August 17, 1986.

I include the entire article for my colleagues' enrichment, but I do want to highlight Colonel Evans' summary argument:

A freeze on defense spending would be an appropriate first step to sort things out. Mindless buying is producing a military described by one former Army general as a "force without power" and at a cost the country cannot afford.

The article follows:

ARE WE DESIGNING FORCES THAT CAN'T WIN?—OUR OWN COMPLEX GEAR COULD BE ENEMY IN WAR

(By David Evans)

When I joined the 3rd Marine Division on Okinawa last year, I was issued brand new equipment. Helmet, pack, canteens, the works. It was the first time in two decades the Marines had ever issued me anything new. Evidence, I thought, that the huge spending increases for defense were finally having an effect. Hard goods were trickling all the way to the tip of the national security spear.

Then I tried to install the leather sweatband in the new German-style helmet made of Kevlar. The simple spring clips on the sweatband of yore had been replaced by fasteners with little metal loops. It took a good half-hour, armed with pliers and jeweler's screwdriver, to work the sweatband into the helmet.

It was obvious the designers of the new headgear were sublimely ignorant of the infantryman's rustic lot in the field, where vise-grip pliers and miniature screwdrivers are as rare as Faberge eggs.

The helmet is symptomatic of the kind of military the United States is producing. It is one rather like the British sports cars of the 1950s. Beautiful to look at, they were nevertheless cantankerous and touchy to operate. Under less than optimum conditions—like rain—their electrical systems were maddening. They stand as an apt paradigm for today's combat systems.

War remains very simple, direct, and brutal. In contrast, our latest combat systems offer baroque complexity. They require the skills of highly trained technicians to understand and maintain. As we have pushed technology, the operating tolerances of our systems have narrowed. The military is now so complex it cannot go to war without air conditioners. Not for the comfort of the troops, mind, but to keep its delicate computers from overheating. The question is whether we are overdesigning forces that cannot win wars.

Indeed, the American military system suffers from seven deadly flaws:

1. The system is not self-correcting. Instead, the American military is stuck in the rut of ingrained and comfortable habit. Too many of the lessons learned painfully years ago remain uncorrected.

When the Marines staggered out of the Chosin Reservoir 35 years ago, they said the standard five-gallon water can was too heavy for troops weakened by fatigue and cold. They suggested a three-gallon, insulated model.

In that engagement, only the simple M-1 rifle, with its loose tolerances and robust operating mechanism, could be kept working in the extreme cold. The temperamental carbine, with its shorter bolt movement, jammed frequently. The complicated Browning Automatic Rifle (BAR) tended to clog with ice, and the Marines urged "simplification of the weapon."

Few of the men who fought that bitter campaign received actual experience in cold-weather operations beforehand. Those who survived commented evasively on the white cloaks worn by the Chinese, which made them all but impossible to spot.

The situation today: White parkas are in the system. Genuine progress there. But the standard water can remains the five-gallon model, uninsulated. "How we're going to get water to the troops remains a basic, unanswered problem," one colonel told me. The M-16A2 rifle, with its close tolerances and short bolt movement, experienced significant failures in cold weather tests in 1984.

The Marines have prepositioned a brigade's worth of equipment in Norway, but they have not designated or trained a specific unit for cold-weather operations.

Whether campaigning in the snow or desert, American troops are likely to encounter Soviet tanks. Their ability to kill them remains dismal. Recall the Army's experience with Task Force Smith, the Rapid Deployment Force of its day, fighting North Korean tanks at Osan in July 1950. The forward companies were overrun because the Army's 2.36-inch bazooka lacked the punch to kill a tank from the front. Today, the infantryman's last-ditch weapon is still essentially a disposable bazooka—the M-72—which fires a warhead that remains too small to inflict a kill.

The Army seems to have forgotten that fighting is largely psychological, and that battles are oftentimes won or lost on the strength of perceptions. If an attacking tank is hit from the front and explodes, an entire armored attack may be halted. Nobody wants to burn to death. On the other hand, if the tank is hit and keeps coming, what incentive does the defending infantryman have to stand and fight?

2. We're easy targets. Three rules for battlefield survival remain unchanged since World War I: keep a low profile, stay off the skyline and spread out. The U.S. military is distinguished by its billboard profile. The standard M-923 cargo truck is a good 10 percent bigger than the M-54 truck of 1960s vintage. Yet the new truck carries the same five-ton load.

The Army's M-2 Bradley troop carrier is fully 10-feet high. Crashing through the woods at Fort Benning, it looks as big as a house.

Standing out against a neutral background is worse—troops moving along the crest of a ridge, for example. There is an electronic skyline, too. Anything that sends out electromagnetic radiation—radars and radios specifically—can reveal one's posi-

tion. The need to transmit has to be balanced against the risk of detection. Instead, radios have become a convenient crutch. There are about 1,100 of them in a Marine division now, filling the air with mostly routine administrative messages, advertising our position like so many searchlights on a dark night.

Omnidirectional antennas aggravate the situation by broadcasting in every direction. Directional antennas would greatly enhance communications security. One of the more powerful tactical radios, the AN-TSC-95, does not come so equipped, and pours its 1,000 watts of power out in all directions, like one of those faceted mirrored balls that hang from discotheque ceilings. Yet a good high-gain, directional antenna can be had for a fraction of the radio's cost. Claims one signals officer, "You can buy a better antenna for the TSC-95 from Radio Shack than the one that comes with it."

Contrary to the need for dispersion, the massive and more powerful electronics tend to aggregate into large headquarters complexes. A division command post looks like an antenna farm, pumping out electromagnetic radiation, as well as heat and noise from ranks of diesel generators, fairly shouting its location.

3. We're too complicated. The virtue of simplicity runs counter to the reigning devotion to complex weapons. Although more can go wrong with complicated systems, the U.S. military is now freighted with unnecessary complexities.

The Pentagon's approach to weapons design is a major contributor. "Cost-effectiveness analysis," says one former Army officer, "tends to drive one to single-purpose weapons because of the one-on-one simulations and the fact that special-interest communities conduct the analyses." The end effect was captured in one recent report, revealing for its frankness on the matter, "All combat-vehicle programs have designed their own unique weapons stations, resulting in a significant number of single-purpose stations with unique logistics . . . heavy demands on training, and little or no interoperability or commonality . . . between different vehicles."

The Air Force and Navy have incompatible aerial-refueling systems. The Air Force flies "female" fighters; its pilots fly next to the tanker and are plugged in by the boom on the mother ship. The Navy flies "male" fighters, mounting a probe the pilot flies into the tanker's fuel receptacle. Unless both systems are mounted on the tanker, as in the case of the new hermaphroditic KC-10, or the modification kit is handy for the older KC-135, the two systems are not interchangeable.

At a more fundamental level, all the players on the battlefield are not dealing in the same units of measure. Infantry units use kilometers and meters for horizontal and vertical measure, using grid coordinates to mark locations. Pilots flying close air support for them deal in nautical miles, feet above sea level, and latitude-longitude locations.

Some aviators claim the difference is trivial, as it is easy to convert from one to the other. But why convert at all? The conversion process injects an unnecessary source of error. The military adopted 24-hour time to eliminate potential confusion. The same argument applies for problems of location.

4. There is not enough slack in the system. We are building systems where anything less than perfect execution can upset the game plan. Loose tolerances are more

forgiving, especially under the terrific and often unpredictable strains of combat. The Navy's latest air-cushioned amphibious landing craft, the LCAC, is a good example of the kind of unforgiving systems now entering service. Since the LCAC is more like a helicopter with the roof off than a boat, the latest employment manual cautions that the "spotting of cargo is critical" to stay within center-of-gravity limits. Three inches is the allowed tolerance. Now imagine doing this with a 60-ton tank from a heaving loading ramp at sea.

Laser-guided bombs are the current rage in high-fashion weaponry. Accurate yes, but they present unique problems. Laser spotter held by troops on the ground generate pulsed codes. These are meant to be read by a seeking device in the nose of the bomb hung under the wing of an aircraft. Yet the ground-based spotter pulses in a three-digit code while the bomb only "recognizes" a four-digit code. So, rather than having both components use the same three- or four-digit code, the bomb's coding has to be carefully translated beforehand into a three-digit equivalent.

There is absolutely no room for error here. Not only must the laser on the ground and the seeker in the air work perfectly, the pilot must be in constant radio contact with the infantryman to ensure that the ground laser is turned on at precisely the right time. If it is turned on too early, the bomb will lock on too early and fall short of the target. Moreover, since the pilot has to ride right down the laser beam, he must come in directly over the soldier's back. Thus, a bomb that falls short is likely to fall on friendly troops.

5. We are not ready for close-in fighting. The Army and Marine Corps have adopted a three-layer approach to anti-tank combat: TOW heavy anti-tank missiles for kills beyond two miles, the DRAGON medium anti-tank missile for kills at about a mile, and shoulder-launched rockets at belt-buckle range.

For these weapons, they have not invested in enough ammunition to do the job. The military does not buy munitions according to war-time need, but on the basis of what share of its peace-time budget it chooses to spend on ammunition. The planned consumption rates that result are absurdly low—in intense combat, one shot every two days for the TOW, and one shot every four days for each DRAGON, for example. "I'll shoot up my allowance in the first five minutes," said one astonished battalion commander when he was informed of these planned firing rates.

Even with adequate stocks of missiles, there are problems. The TOW can be spoofed by smoke and heat. The DRAGON is notoriously unreliable. After a decade of neglect the Army is finally moving to replace the near-useless DRAGON with an effective weapon of European design, but only for select units such as Rangers.

However, few battles are won or lost at long range. Opening fire early at long range can betray one's positions, and Rommel, a master at setting anti-tank ambushes, repeatedly inveighed against opening fire too soon for this very reason.

The nature of the battleground probably will not allow for the distant shots, anyway. Germany, for example, is heavily wooded and urbanized, and the Bundeswehr estimates 55 percent of all targets will be sighted at less than a quarter-mile. The Soviets, too, figure roughly 60 percent of all anti-tank engagements will take place within a half-mile range.

Army Gen. Frederick J. Kroesen, former commander of NATO's Central Army Group, is even more conservative. "Fog . . . and smokegenerating devices in abundance lead me to believe the next war will be won or lost at the 300-meter (fifth of a mile) range, just as in the past."

It is at this vital range that American troops are most vulnerable to the unnerving psychological impact of massed armored attacks, and where they stand virtually naked. The Army and Marines are buying the AT-4 shoulder-fired rocket to replace the M-72. It is not much of an improvement and is known among cynics as "The Paint-Scratcher" because it will not penetrate the frontal armor of modern Soviet tanks.

Effective alternatives are available. Yet the situation now is that Soviet tanks will be able to break through at close range, and then there is almost no limit to what they can do. They will create havoc in the rear, overrunning artillery units with impunity. The standard U.S. 155-mm artillery piece, although an excellent weapon for long-range fire, cannot kill tanks at close range, as it does not come supplied with anti-tank shells.

6. We are over-centralized. The swirling nature of a mechanized war of movement, slugged out at the small-unit level, calls for on-the-spot decisions. Leaders at the head of their troops will see more and react more quickly than commanders in the rear.

"There is no inspiration in the squeaking voice made dim and quavering by a mile of (telephone) wire," said Patton. But state of the art has come to mean centralized command, and a growing family of esoteric command-and-control systems are intended to push the flow of information to the rear.

This definition from a Marine Corps handbook is instructive: "Command-and-control is an active system for decision-making where decision-makers are *some distance from events* (emphasis added) on which their decision is based," and (significantly) "from the people who must carry it out!"

Note the shift away from officers as commanders and leaders to pallid "decision-makers" who, like wingless queen bees, are absolutely dependent on a rich flow of information from engaged troops who have more pressing matters than sending detailed reports to the rear. The big difference from the bunker generalship of the First World War is that what was once done with telephone lines now take place via radio.

The on-site, personal presence of the commander remains the greatest "force multiplier" of all. Instead, he has been pushed to the rear, snuggled up to a dozen or more radios, all broadcasting like beacons telling the enemy exactly where he is.

There are signs of change. Col. Creighton Abrams Jr., commander of the Army's 3rd Infantry Division artillery in Germany and son of the late Army chief of staff, suggests committing each artillery unit in a sector to support a designated front-line maneuver battalion. "This violates the time-honored principle of maximum feasible centralized control of artillery," Abrams admits, "but it frees up the bottleneck" of trying to control all the artillery firing from a central location. Abrams' argument for decentralization recognizes the fast-paced nature of modern maneuver combat, where there isn't time for elaborate coordination through centralized facilities far to the rear.

7. We do not push ourselves in training. The prospect of our complex systems working in battle is not likely to be discovered in

peacetime, because our units and systems are rarely stressed under less than ideal conditions. Most large-scale exercises lack operational realism. Intended to orchestrate and rehearse the complicated command relationships stemming from over-centralization, the basic systems are not challenged.

"We should start field problems with a quarter instead of a full tank of gas," says one logistician, in order to pressure the supply systems from the first hours.

Despite all the Pentagon hype about Soviet numerical superiority, we do not train to deal with it. Maneuvers are typically carried out against token and hopelessly outnumbered enemy forces. Although battalion commanders are admonished they must be prepared to fight outnumbered, they practice against company-size foes. Local air superiority is taken for granted. Frequent time-outs are provided to refresh and supply units.

The ingrained and comfortable habits of peacetime exercises are not easily shed; recall that 6,500 troops were hurled against a few hundred haphazardly armed Cubans at Grenada.

Occasionally the defense establishment admits to itself things are badly amiss. Last spring the RAND Corp., a Pentagon-funded think tank, offered this confessional to its board of trustees. "The Army is currently deploying increasing numbers of technically sophisticated weapons that are hard to maintain, extremely expensive, and whose wartime demand rates are difficult to forecast." This assessment applies with equal, if not greater force, to the other armed services.

Appearances can lead to a false perception of power, and the U.S. military stands like a fine porcelain figure, good for display but best not dropped onto the hard surface of the battlefield. How did we get here? By not looking at the reality of war. "Touchy, sensitive, delicate technology has no place at the front line," asserts one Marine reserve colonel. He's right, of course, but that is what the troops have got.

Faddish jargon has become a substitute for clear and serious thinking about the underlying foundations of combat effectiveness. Poetry devoid of philosophy is merely verse, and spending absent a sound concept of national defense is simply procurement. A freeze on defense spending would be an appropriate first step to sort things out. Mindless buying is producing a military described by one former Army general as a "force without power," and at a cost the country cannot afford.

CONVERT SEES THE LIGHT ON NICARAGUA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my liberal colleagues to carefully read the enclosed article by a repentant radical who has seen the light on Nicaragua.

Mr. David Horowitz, founder of the New Left and a leader of the first anti-Vietnam demonstrations in the United States, apparently has taken the time to investigate his own liberal double standards, which characteristically are soft on communism and exorcise America's

allies. For Horowitz, the convoluted perception of reality which liberals embrace is most apparent in the debate on Nicaragua. As Horowitz states, "If my former comrades who support the . . . Sandinistas were to pause for a moment and then plunge their busy political minds into the human legacies of their activist pasts, they would instantly drown in an ocean of blood."

Sadly, his statement is true. Communists have left a legacy of blood, destruction, and oppression. Are we going to let this happen in Nicaragua? It is high time that others like Mr. Horowitz realize that the Soviet Union and other Communist regimes are not to be coddled or treated as moral equivalents but must be vigorously opposed before their terrible legacy can expand unchecked.

I again urge my liberal colleagues to read this article. If someone like David Horowitz can see the light, perhaps some of you will too.

A NEW LEFT RADICAL RECANTS

(By David Horowitz)

(Following are excerpts from a speech given at the University of California in Berkeley. David Horowitz was a founder of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and editor of the radical Ramparts magazine. His recent book (co-authored with Peter Collier) entitled "The Kennedys: An American Drama," was on the New York Times and other best-seller lists for months. We thank Mr. Horowitz for his permission to publish these observations.)

Twenty-five years ago I was one of the founders of the New Left. I was one of the organizers of the first political demonstration on the Berkeley campus—and indeed on any campus—to protest our government's anti-Communist policies in Cuba and Vietnam. Tonight I come before you as the kind of man I used to tell myself I would never be.

I offer no apologies for my present position. It was what I thought was the humanity of the Marxist idea that made me what I was then; it is the inhumanity of what I have seen to be the Marxist reality that has made me what I am now. If my former comrades who support the (Nicaraguan) Sandinistas were to pause for a moment and then plunge their busy political minds into the human legacies of their activist pasts, they would instantly drown in an ocean of blood.

The issue before us is not whether it is morally right for the United States to arm the contras, or whether there are unpleasant men among them. Nor is it whether the United States should defer to the wisdom of the Contadora powers—more than thirty years ago the United States tried to overthrow Somoza, and it was the Contadora powers of the time who bailed him out.

The issue before us and before all people who cherish freedom is how to oppose a Soviet imperialism so vicious and so vast as to dwarf any previously known. An "ocean of blood" is no metaphor. As we speak here to-night, this empire—whose axis runs through Havana and now Managua—is killing hundreds of thousands of Ethiopians to consolidate a dictatorship whose policies against its black citizens make the South African government look civilized and humane.

A second issue, especially important to me, is the credibility and commitment of the American Left.

Today the Left dismisses . . . warnings about Soviet expansion as anti-Communist

paranoia, a threat to the peace, and a mask for American imperialism. We said the same things about Truman when he warned us then. Russia's control of Eastern Europe, we said, was only a defensive buffer, a temporary response to American power—first, because Russia had no nuclear weapons; and then, because it lacked the missiles to deliver them.

Today, the Soviet Union is a nuclear super-power, missiles and all, but it has not given up an inch of the empire which it gained during World War II—not Eastern Europe, not the Baltic states which Hitler delivered to Stalin and whose nationhood Stalin erased and which are not all but forgotten, not even the Kurile Islands which were once part of Japan.

Not only have the Soviets failed to relinquish their conquests in all these years—years of dramatic, total decolonization in the West—but their growing strength and the wounds of Vietnam have encouraged them to reach for more. South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Ethiopia, Yemen, Mozambique, and Angola are among the dominoes which have recently fallen into the Soviet orbit.

To expand its territorial core—which apologists still refer to as a "defensive perimeter"—Moscow has already slaughtered a million peasants in Afghanistan, an atrocity warmly endorsed by the Sandinista government.

Minister of Defense Humberto Ortega describes the army of the conquerors—whose scorched-earth policy has driven half the Afghan population from its homes—as the "pillar of peace" in the world today. To any self-respecting socialist, praise for such barbarism would be an inconceivable outrage—as it was to the former Sandinista, now contra, Eden Pastora. But praise for the barbarians is sincere tribute coming from the Sandinista rulers, because they see themselves as an integral part of the Soviet empire itself.

"The struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting." So writes the Czech novelist Milan Kundera, whose name and work no longer exist in his homeland.

In all the Americas, Fidel Castro was the only head of state to cheer the Soviet tanks as they rolled over the brave people of Prague. And cheering right along with Fidel were Carlos Fonseca, Tomas Borge, Humberto Ortega, and the other creators of the present Nicaraguan regime.

One way to assess what has happened in Nicaragua is to realize that wherever Soviet tanks crush freedom from now on, there will be two governments in the Americas supporting them all the way.

About its own crimes and for its own criminals, the Left has no memory at all.

To the Left I grew up in, along with the Sandinista founders, Stalin's Russia was a socialist paradise, the model of the liberated future. Literacy to the uneducated, power to the weak, justice to the forgotten—we praised the Soviet Union then, just as the Left praises the Sandinistas now.

In the society we hailed as a new human dawn, 100 million people were put in slave-labor camps, in conditions rivaling Auschwitz and Buchenwald. Between 30 and 40 million people were killed—in peacetime, in the daily routine of socialist rule. While leftists applauded their progressive policies and guarded their frontiers, Soviet Marxists killed more peasants, more workers, and even more Communists than all the capitalist governments together since the beginning of time.

The Left would still be denying the Soviet atrocities if the perpetrators themselves had not finally acknowledged their crimes. In 1956, in a secret speech to the party elite, Khrushchev made the crimes a Communist fact; but it was only the CIA that actually made the fact public, allowing radicals to come to terms with what they had done.

Khrushchev and his cohorts could not have cared less about the misplaced faith and misspent lives of their naive supporters on the Left. The Soviet rulers were concerned about themselves: Stalin's mania had spread the slaughter into his henchmen's ranks; they wanted to make totalitarianism safe for its rulers. In place of a dictator whose paranoia could not be controlled, they instituted a dictatorship by directorate—which (not coincidentally) is the form of rule in Nicaragua today. Repression would work one way only: from the privileged top of society to the powerless bottom.

The year of Khrushchev's speech—which is also the year Soviet tanks flattened the freedom fighters of Budapest—is the year that tells us who the Sandinistas really are.

Because the truth had to be admitted at last, the Left all over the world was forced to redefine itself in relation to the Soviet facts. China's Communist leader Mao liked Stalin's way better. Twenty-five million people died in the "great leaps" and "cultural revolutions" he then launched. In Europe and America, however, a new anti-Stalinist Left was born. This New Left, of which I was one of the founders, was repelled by the evils it was now forced to see, and embarrassed by the tarnish the Soviet totalitarians had brought to the socialist cause. It turned its back on the Soviet model of Stalin and his heirs.

But the Sandinista vanguard was neither embarrassed nor repelled. In 1957, Carlos Fonseca, the founding father of the Sandinista Front, visited the Soviet Union with its newly efficient totalitarian state. To Fonseca, as to Borge and his other comrades, the Soviet monstrosity was their revolutionary dream come true. In his pamphlet, *A Nicaraguan in Moscow*, Fonseca proclaimed Soviet Communism his model for Latin America's revolutionary future.

This vision of a Soviet America is now being realized in Nicaragua. The commandante directorate, the army, and the secret police are already mirrors of the Soviet state—not only structurally but in their personnel, trained and often manned by agents of the Soviet axis.

But the most important figure in this transformation is not a Nicaraguan at all. For twenty years, from the time the Sandinistas first arrived in Havana, they were disciples of Fidel Castro. With his blessings they went on to Moscow, where Stalin's henchman completed their revolutionary course. Fidel is the image in which the Sandinista leadership has created itself and the author of its strategy. Its politburo, the commandante directorate, was personally created by Fidel in Havana on the eve of the final struggle, sealed with a pledge of millions in military aid. It was Fidel who supplied the arms with which the Sandinistas waged their battles, just as he supplied the Cuban general—Zenen Casals—who directed their victorious campaign (just as the Soviets supplied the general who directed Fidel's own victory at the Bay of Pigs). Without Castro's intervention, Arturo Cruz and the other anti-Somoza and pro-democratic contras would be the government of Nicaragua today.

And it was Fidel who showed the Sandinistas how to steal the revolution after the victory, and how to secure their theft by manipulating their most important allies: the American Left and its liberal sympathizers.

To believe in the revolutionary dream is the tragedy of its supporters; to exploit the dream is the talent of its dictators. Revolutionary cynicism, the source of this talent, is Fidel's most important teaching to his Sandinista disciples. This is the faculty that allows the comandantes to emulate Fidel himself: to be poets and hangmen at the same time. To promise democracy or organize repression, to attack imperialism and join an empire, to talk peace and plan war, to champion justice and deliver Nicaragua to a fraternity of inhumane, repressive, militarized, and economically crippled states.

"We used to have one main prison, now we have many," begins the lament of Carlos Franqui, a former Fidelista, for the paradise that Nicaragua has now gained. "We used to have a few barracks; now we have many. We used to have many plantations; now we have only one, and it belongs to Fidel. Who enjoys the fruits of the revolution, the houses of the rich, the luxuries of the rich? The comandante and his court."

The idea that Marxist revolution will mean economic benefit for the poor has proved to be the most deadly illusion of all. It is because Marxist economies cannot satisfy economic needs—not even at the levels of the miserably corrupt capitalism of Batista and Somoza—that Marxist states require permanent repression to stifle unrest and permanent enemies to saddle with the blame. This is also why Castro has found a new national product to supply to the Soviet market (a product his Sandinista disciples are in the process of developing in their turn). The product is the Cuban nation itself, as a military base for Soviet expansion.

The event that sealed the contract for this development was the moment of America's defeat in Vietnam in April 1975. This defeat resulted in America's effective withdrawal from the crucial role it had played since 1945, as the guardian of the international status quo and the keeper of its peace.

To the Soviet imperialists, America's loss was an opportunity gained. In 1975 the Kremlin began what would soon be a tenfold increase in the aid it has been providing to Cuba. Most of the aid was of military intent. Toward the end of the year, 36,000 Cuban troops surfaced in Africa, as an interventionary force in Angola's civil war. Soviet aid to Cuba tripled and then quintupled as Castro sent another 12,000 Cuban troops to provide a palace guard for Ethiopia's new dictator. Mengistu Haile Mariam, who had thrown himself into the Soviet embrace with a campaign which he officially called his "Red Terror." A year after his henchmen had murdered virtually the entire graduating class of the high schools of Addis Ababa—just the most poignant of Mengistu's 100,000 victims—Fidel presented him with a Bay of Pigs medal. Cuban socialism's highest award.

Ethiopia's dictator is only one of the international heroes who regularly pass through the Cuban base to be celebrated, trained, and integrated into a network of subversion and terror that has come to span every continent of the globe. And in the Sandinista revolution Fidel's colonial plantation has produced its most profitable return: an opportunity for Moscow to

expand its investment to the American land mass itself.

Nicaragua is now in the grip of utterly cynical and utterly ruthless men, exceeding even their sponsors in aggressive hostility to the United States. The Soviets may be the covert patrons of the world's terrorist plague, but not even they have had the temerity to embrace publicly the assassin Qaddafi as a "brother" the way the Sandinistas have. The aim of the Sandinista resolution is to crush its society from top to bottom, to institute totalitarian rule, and to use the country as a base to spread Communist terror and Communist regimes throughout the hemispheres.

The Sandinista anthem which proclaims the Yankee to be the "enemy of mankind" expresses precisely the revolutionaries' sentiment and goal. That goal is hardly to create a more just society—the sordid record would dissuade any reformer from choosing the Communist path—but to destroy the societies still outside the totalitarian perimeter, and their chief protector, the United States.

I would like to say this to my former comrades and successors on the Left: you are self-righteous and blind in your belief that you are part of a movement to advance human progress and liberate mankind. You are in fact in a league with the darkest and most reactionary forces of the modern world, whose legacies—as the record attests—are atrocities and oppressions on a scale unknown in the human past. It is no accident that radicals in power have slaughtered so many of their own people. Hatred of self, and by extension one's country is the root of the radical cause.

As American radicals, the most egregious sin you commit is to betray the privileges and freedoms ordinary people from all over the world have created in this country—privileges and freedoms that ordinary people all over the world would feel blessed to have themselves. But the worst of it is this: you betray all this tangible good that you can see around you for a socialist pie-in-the-sky that has meant horrible deaths and miserable lives for the hundreds of millions who have so far fallen under its sway.

TROUBLE IN PARADISE: THE SOVIETS MAKE INROADS IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union sees the South Pacific as a vital area into which they are projecting economic, diplomatic, and military influence. Our country must do more to protect U.S. interests in that strategic region. We must act forcefully and decisively in formulating a stronger policy for the South Pacific.

Recent events have shown that now is the time for the United States Government to do more to buttress our South Pacific foreign policy in order to keep the Russian bear out of the South Pacific. Already, a number of island nations in that area are responding to Soviet overtures. Believe it or not, the Russians have succeeded in opening the door to the South Pacific.

Using the former United States military base at Cam Rahn Bay in Vietnam, the Soviet Pa-

cific Fleet is growing and extending its area of operations. The Soviet Union is attempting to sign fishing and port access agreements, and establish diplomatic relations with a number of South Pacific nations. Soviet influence will inevitably grow and United States will suffer in the final analysis.

Now is the time to strengthen our relations with the nations in the South Pacific. It is time for us to act quickly and firmly. That region is too important for us to ignore.

With these thoughts in mind, I commend the following speech at the Heritage Foundation by Representative BEN BLAZ of the Territory of Guam to my colleagues in the Congress.

The text of the speech follows:

RETURNING TO PARADISE: COMBATING THE SOVIET THREAT TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC

(By Representative BEN BLAZ)

The Southwest Pacific is no longer a peaceful, palm fringed preserve of American goodwill. The region, long a staunch U.S. ally, has been thrust into the global struggle by a new Soviet strategy. The South Pacific has become the newest area of super-power rivalry.

The U.S. faces a three-pronged Soviet strategy in the region. Soviet naval expansion has made their Pacific fleet their largest and gained them their long-sought goal of a warm water port at Vietnam's Cam Rahn Bay—ironically a U.S.-built port.

Politically, they are attempting to inject themselves into the region through expanded diplomatic contacts and efforts at spreading nuclear free fallacies. Those efforts are complemented by economic ploys such as so-called fishing and economic development agreements aimed at securing port access and eventually naval and air facilities.

The Soviets are capitalizing on several trends in the region: (1) the rise in nationalistic/anti-colonial sentiment; (2) the spread of nuclear free Pacific fervor; (3) resentment over disputes with U.S. commercial fishermen; and (4) resentment with French nuclear and colonial policies. These developments threaten a major pillar of our Pacific Basin policy—strategic denial of the area to hostile outside forces.

The stakes are substantial: (1) the U.S. alliance structure in the Pacific and Southeast Asia; (2) vital sea lines of communication to U.S. allies and trading partners; (3) the right of passage and port entry for our nuclear Navy; (4) access to the natural resources of Oceania and the Indian Ocean; and (5) American prestige in the all-important Asia-Pacific era.

TWOFOLD NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

There are really two problems confronting the United States in the South Pacific: the long-term Soviet challenge in the region and the current trend of the area's nations to flirt back.

The Soviet half of the equation is easiest to understand. Soviet leaders have decided to become players in Asia and the Pacific because of the phenomenal increase in trade and development in the region and the Pacific Basin's enormous potential for future growth.

The expansion over the past decade of the Soviet Pacific Fleet—which is now the largest fleet in their navy—and the development of Soviet naval and air bases at Cam Rahn Bay are the most visible signs of this new Soviet thrust in the region.

The Soviets want to gain access and bases for their fleet and aircraft through fishing

and other economic development and diplomatic agreements; and they seek to deny U.S. ships and aircraft access and bases and encouraging nuclear paranoia and underwriting extremist elements of the nuclear free Pacific movement.

The problem of South Pacific nations flirting back at the Soviets is less clearly understood. Previous Soviet attempts in the 1970s were ignored or rebuffed by South Pacific nations. But now some of these nations are responding, accepting Soviet aid and diplomatic relations, and providing port access and on-shore facilities for Soviet commercial vessels.

New Zealand has refused U.S. nuclear Navy port visits because the Labor Party there has swallowed the fatal fallacy, actively promoted by Soviet propaganda, that unilaterally banning our nuclear Navy will protect them. The United States has responded by ending New Zealand's role in the ANZUS Mutual Defense Pact.

The Republic of Kiribati is renewing its \$1.5 million fishing agreement with the Soviets and may add port access to the benefits granted Soviet vessels. This agreement allows Soviet trawlers and spy ships access to the largest exclusive economic zone in the Pacific—several million square miles—and positions their spy ships to observe testing at our Kwajalein Missile Test Range in the Marshalls.

Kiribati leaders have said they entered this Russian gambit out of disgust and resentment with the U.S. failure to enter a tuna fishing rights agreement that would allow the island to collect fishing fees from U.S. tuna boats.

Vanuatu has decided to establish diplomatic ties with Cuba, Libya, and the Soviet Union as well as provide the Soviets port and on-shore facilities at Espiritu Santo (a U.S. base in World War II) in a soon-to-be-announcing fishing treaty. Vanuatu's proximity to the racially troubled French colony of New Caledonia and potential for influencing developments there are very disturbing.

Traditional friends such as Fiji also are entertaining Soviet offers of fishing treaties.

Anger with French nuclear and colonial policies has led to heightened anti-nuclear sentiment and the development of South Pacific nuclear free zones. French policies in Tahiti and New Caledonia also create resentment in the region and these anti-French feelings wash onto the United States because of the mistaken belief that we can force the French to change their policies.

The South Pacific, our World War II ally, is allowing Soviet inroads because of disillusionment with the United States and resentment with what the region's leaders see as our lack of interest in their welfare as well as disagreement over fishing policies.

In a sense, we are the victims of the passing of the Coral Sea generation. Those South Pacific leaders who remember the American servicemen, American democracy and equality, and the enormous productive power of the American economy are passing. This generation is being replaced by a younger generation which has no memory of the war-years partnership. They are more critical of our commitment to the region and want to see positive action from us to demonstrate our interest. Our reservoir of goodwill has not run out completely but we can see the end to it unless we act soon and act forcefully.

The most pressing issue is resentment with what the leaders see as years of "Jolly

Roger" tactics by American tuna boat operators who refused to recognize the islands' fishery rights and would not pay fishing fees for tuna caught in the nation's exclusive economic zones—their major sources of wealth.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the deep resentment these "tuna wars" have created in the region. It is not an exaggeration to say that the current U.S. image in the South Pacific is dominated by the vision of rapacious and arrogant tuna boat operators.

Kiribati's Russian gambit is seen in the area as a direct result of the U.S. government's unwillingness to negotiate a new fishing pact recognizing these rights and fee payments.

The absence of adequate and clearly targeted U.S. financial aid to the region and the possible cut in AID funding for the next fiscal year are also a large part of the problem.

COMBATING THE SOVIET THREAT TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC

There is not much that can be done in the short term about Soviet adventurism in the region, but there is much we can do about the sudden receptivity of the region to Soviet allurements.

A complete denial of a Soviet presence in the region is not feasible or probably even desirable. We have political and economic relations with the Soviet Union, as do our closest allies. Why shouldn't the South Pacific?

Most important, we must recognize the roots of the problem in the South Pacific lie in changing leadership and the perceptions of the new regional leaders with short-term economic and political problems with the United States.

Who are these new generation leaders and what is it they seek for their nations? What do they want from the Soviets and us?

"The Pacific Way" is anti-colonial, yet conservative; traditionalist yet Christian; issues are openly debated but resolved through quiet compromise and consensus decision making.

The region is politically and culturally conservative with a strong commitment to democratic institutions and pluralistic societies. Interpersonal relationships are extremely important. Face-to-face dealings can solve problems thought unsolvable.

There is no grinding poverty, no clashing class conflicts. Families and Kin groups provide basic necessities and bind all levels of society.

The ideal leader in the Pacific Way is the person who distributes the food, goods, resources as widely and fairly as possible.

So in international perceptions and relations, South Pacific leaders tend to view issues in terms of which countries can best approach the ideal of the Pacific Way—which country will be seen as giving—or thought likely to give—the fairest payments for services or the fairest amount of aid.

In short, the Pacific Way is diametrically opposed to everything communist doctrine and practice stand for. Despite our disagreements with regional leaders, the South Pacific retains a strong affinity for Americans and American ideals. Island leaders welcome U.S. interests, involvement, and concern, especially if it is followed up with aid and trade over the long term.

Few regional leaders savor the prospects of superpower competition, but they have discovered the best way to get our attention is to flirt back at the communists.

The leaders and people of the South Pacific want to be our friends. Can we be theirs?

LESSONS FROM FREE ASSOCIATION NEGOTIATIONS

The long, complex negotiations between the U.S. and Micronesia grappled with the same basic issues we face in the South Pacific today: How to meet the conflicting needs and wants of small Pacific island nations while protecting our preeminent strategic interests in the region.

The island mini-states want independence, sovereignty, dignity as members of the world community, political stability and, most important, assured long-term economic growth so they can gain a better life for their people. The United States wants assurance of political stability and strategic denial of the area to hostile outside forces.

The outcome of 17 years of difficult negotiations with Micronesia was the U.S. recognition that there is not necessarily an inherent conflict between self-determination/economic development and strategic denial.

By our recognizing that we had a responsibility and self-interest in accepting and respecting Micronesia's sovereignty and underwriting its development, the Micronesians, persuaded by our willingness to negotiate a long-term commitment, were willing to endorse and support our strategic interests.

The South Pacific is not in the same situation as Micronesia but what I believe they are saying to us is, if we are not interested in their long-term economic well-being (beyond lip service and about \$8 to \$10 million a year in development aid), then they will go elsewhere for underwriters.

The essence of the free association agreement with Micronesia—a long-term, comprehensive commitment to the region's political and economic development in return for strategic denial of the area—is the solution we are seeking with the South Pacific.

I am not suggesting we enter an auction with the Soviets for the favor of the South Pacific. That leads us into a game of manipulation we should not play and does not address the real long-term needs of the region.

Nor am I suggesting we shoulder the burden alone. Whatever we do in the region, we must do it as a community effort with regional organizations like the South Pacific Forum and our major allies, especially Japan, Australia and New Zealand. This does not mean the aid cannot be bilateral and clearly marked USA.

I am not talking about huge expenditures even over the long run. There is a fundamental reality of scale here that places clear limits on the amount of aid the islands can absorb. There are about 5 million people on islands scattered over several million miles of ocean.

THOUGHTS ON AN ECONOMIC/POLITICAL STRATEGY FOR THE PACIFIC BASIN

In conclusion, I offer the following thoughts for a plan to combat the Soviet threat to the South Pacific:

(1) In conjunction with our allies, negotiate with the region a comprehensive, long-term development plan, properly scaled to the size and needs of the island nations—a South Pacific initiative that addresses immediate solutions to major stress points in our relationship with the region; conclude at the earliest possible time a fisheries treaty recognizing the EEZs and fishing free rights of the region.

This plan should also address long range plans to better integrate, economically and

strategically, the South Pacific, Micronesia, and our Southeast Asian allies.

(2) Upgrade our presence. Our physical presence in the region is minimal and that lack of constant personal contact on leadership as well as academic and people-to-people levels feeds an impression of the U.S. as unconcerned, uncaring, and uninterested in the welfare of South Pacific people.

We need to return to paradise, to rediscover the South Pacific on all levels—diplomatically and politically, with expanded cultural ties, tourism, business investment—a broad spectrum presence.

(3) Strengthen the moderate center. Expand the moderate center of the political spectrum in the region through regional approach and support. Allow moderates to bring extremist nations around through Pacific Way consensus.

(4) Clarify our nuclear position and disengage from the French connection through an expanded public diplomacy effort in the region. The U.S. does not now and does not intend to dump nuclear waste, conduct nuclear tests, or store nuclear weapons in the South Pacific.

This policy conforms with the basic needs of the island states for nuclear weapons free societies.

We have little control over French actions, and if we cannot make them see their nuclear testing policy is creating strategic problems in the region, we should reevaluate our position on French nuclear testing and, if needed, clearly disassociate from their policy.

We must also seriously examine and, if necessary, clearly disassociate ourselves from French colonial policy in Tahiti and New Caledonia. The volatile situation in New Caledonia and the specter of racial war there between the indigenous Melanesians and white settlers requires us to speak out on behalf of democratic self-determination. We have an excellent, progressive record of fostering self-determination in the Philippines and Micronesia. We should not allow ourselves to be associated with French Policies that regional leaders view as colonial and regressive. We must continue to stress that any unilateral barring of U.S. nuclear forces is dangerous and destabilizing because it can generate in nations a perception of superior Soviet strength and the attendant political influence that might be gained by that perception.

HOLY CROSS CHURCH TO MARK CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, Archbishop Theodore E. McCarrick, of the archdiocese of Newark, will preside and will be principal celebrant at a mass with more than 25 priests on the altar of Holy Cross Church, Harrison, NJ, at 12 noon on Sunday, September 14, 1986, to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the dedication of Holy Cross Church building. Holy Cross is the oldest Catholic parish in the West Hudson area.

Among the coc celebrants will be the pastor, Rev. Msgr. Hugh A. O'Donnell, who will be joined by the present and former curates of the church and by 25 of the more than 40 priests who grew up in the parish. They will be

coming from many different cities to participate in the celebration. Most Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick, archbishop of Newark, will deliver the homily.

Over the past century, the parish has grown in population but decreased in area. In 1868, when it was founded as a mission parish, it numbered approximately 400 families and stretched as far north as Lyndhurst. Now covering only Harrison, it serves about 1,200 families. Holy Cross is the mother church of St. Cecilia's, Kearny.

The name has also been changed. When the Mission Church of St. Pius at Third and Jersey Streets was replaced by the present imposing edifice, it was consecrated as the Church of the Holy Cross. Parish records do not reveal any reason for this name change. Served in early years by priests from St. Patrick's Pro-Cathedral, Newark, the first resident pastor was Rev. James J. McGahan, who was assigned in 1871.

He was succeeded in 1974 by Rev. Thaddeus Hogan. In 1878, Rev. Pierce McCarthy became pastor, and in 1883, Rev. Maurice P. O'Connor assumed the pastoral duties. It was during his pastorate that the present church was built, with the cornerstone being laid on the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1886. Father O'Connor was very active in the community affairs until his death on December 13, 1913.

In April 1914, Msgr. George J. Fitzpatrick became pastor. It was he, who, in 1928, erected the twin towers of the church which house one of the finest sets of chimes in the country, an 11-bell carillon. The present Holy Cross School was erected at Fourth and Jersey Streets in 1915 during the tenure of Msgr. G.L. Fitzpatrick.

In June 1942, Msgr. William A. Costelloe, who had been a curate at Holy Cross, became pastor. Under his administration, the extensive library was established in the school and the children's playground property was acquired.

Following the death of Monsignor Costelloe, Msgr. Harold V. Fitzpatrick became pastor in 1964. Unused for many years because of worn out parts, the chimes were restored and started ringing again on Easter Sunday of 1968. During Monsignor Fitzpatrick's pastorage, he modernized the church auditorium which included the addition of another entrance, serving both the church proper and the auditorium.

In 1972, Rev. Edwin J. Paulmann was appointed pastor of Holy Cross. All the stained glass windows, which had been originally crafted in Germany, were repaired or replaced as necessary. Father Paulmann conscientiously maintained the church building until his retirement.

Rev. Msgr. Hugh A. O'Donnell was appointed pastor in 1981. Monsignor O'Donnell has continued to make improvements on the entire physical property of Holy Cross, including the convent, the school, and the church. Recognizing the desire of the newly arriving Portuguese-speaking people to worship God in their own language, Monsignor O'Donnell was instrumental in providing a Portuguese language mass every Sunday in Holy Cross Church with the services of a Portuguese-speaking priest to meet their spiritual needs.

Holy Cross Church has helped people in their worship of God for 100 years and, God willing, will continue to do so for many years more.

I am sure my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and those former parishioners of Holy Cross Church wish to join me in paying tribute to a grand and illustrious parish.

I will close with a fervent wish on behalf of all the good people of many nationalities, supporters, and friends that the Holy Cross Church prospers and continues its good works in its second century.

FLORIDA GRAPEFRUIT HELPS "PEEL-IT-OFF"

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, more and more physicians are agreeing that a proper diet and weight control are prime ways to reduce the overall risk of disease. Cancer, hypertension, diabetes, osteoporosis, and coronary heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer, are just a few of the diseases where diet appears to play an important role in prevention and control.

As health care costs, now some \$400 million per year, continue to rise, nutrition is becoming of increasing concern to consumers, businesses, and legislators. Lost productivity, unfit workers, and limitations to mobility from poor health and shortened lifespans are just a few of the conditions which could respond to national nutritional diligence.

Despite increased media coverage of nutrition in recent years, Americans still struggle with achieving a healthful diet and fit lifestyle. Almost 90 percent of Americans think they weigh too much, according to Better Homes and Gardens magazine. Some 115 million are trying to diet each year. Weight problems are increasing in children, with some 10 to 15 percent of youngsters and 20 percent of teens judged to be overweight.

A telephone poll conducted by the Hearst Corp. revealed that more than half of the respondents did not know how many calories women ages 20-45 need daily. More than half of those surveyed did not know that the human body gets energy from carbohydrates, protein, and fat, or what percentage of excess pounds was necessary to be considered obese.

Americans are, by and large, nutritionally ignorant, and they are looking for more information to help them develop the healthy lifestyles they would like. A recent Food Marketing Institute study revealed that more than one-third of Americans feel supermarkets should supply nutrition information.

The Florida Department of Citrus has been a leader in providing the American public with helpful nutrition information. For more than 50 years, American shoppers have been able to learn basic nutrition principles through programs and materials sponsored by the Florida Department of Citrus.

This year, the FDOC is spearheading a new campaign to continue to encourage consum-

ers to pay attention to their diet. It is called Peel-It-Off. This diet and fitness program is designed to motivate consumers to consider January 1987 as National Diet Month, a time to start the new year with better health habits and to undo any excesses and negligence of health indulged in during the holidays.

Florida citrus growers are proud of the nutritional quality of their fruit. Their grapefruit is an excellent source of vitamin C, potassium, B vitamins and fiber, and has only 80 calories per grapefruit.

The Peel-It-Off educational effort will promote safe and healthful eating, whatever an individual's diet and exercise plan may be. Backed by nationwide print publicity, and using a celebrity dieter to motivate consumers to take charge of their health, this intensive 1-month effort will provide much needed encouragement to the thousands of Americans who seek healthier, more productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, through my capacity as Florida's only Representative on the House Agriculture Committee, and given the importance of sound nutrition and the serious consequences to our Nation if it is neglected, I hereby submit for this RECORD this outline of the Peel-It-Off Program and urge my colleagues to support the Florida Department of Citrus' efforts to promote January as National Diet Month.

DEPUTY SECRETARY
WHITEHEAD ON FOREIGN AID

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, congressional budget cutting has been such that even the most traditional and essential expenditures are being called into question, and some Americans believe that foreign assistance is a good place to begin with the scissors. But as Deputy Secretary John C. Whitehead explains in the following letter, much of our foreign assistance serves more than one purpose, one of which is American national security. In many cases to cut foreign aid is to diminish the American foreign presence and endanger the bases for the American forces which are posted abroad to guarantee American security. I hope my colleagues will consider closely the arguments which Deputy Secretary Whitehead advances in this letter to the Wall Street Journal of September 3, 1986.

A SAVING THE U.S. CAN'T AFFORD

Harry Shaw (editorial page, July 15) argues that the administration has overstated the seriousness of the \$5 billion cut in its request of \$22.6 billion for the international-affairs functions of the fiscal 1987 budget. Mr. Shaw contends that the administration can muddle through without dire consequences if we shave "big-ticket items" such as aid to Israel, Egypt, NATO and other allies who provide military facilities to us, and assistance to Central America; and if Congress gives the administration more flexibility in allocating foreign aid.

Mr. Shaw's analysis is a strategy of retreat. By concentrating only on 1987, he neglects the broader context and trends of our diminishing resources for foreign assistance.

FY 1987 is the second straight year of major budget cuts in foreign aid funds, and there is every indication that the same restrictive budgetary environment will be with us in 1988 and beyond. The question is not whether we can adjust to a single year's budget problem—we could—but whether we can afford continuing erosion of the vital U.S. security interests that sustained lower foreign assistance levels will bring about.

Mr. Shaw mistakenly assumes that countries providing us military facilities will accept without question the deep reductions he contemplates. Our friends see their interests clearly—and they must now measure them in an environment of declining benefits of cooperating with the U.S. and rising costs in terms of threats to their security.

Our development and security assistance requests for \$16.2 billion in 1987 serve interrelated and crucial objectives:

—34% would go to Israel and Egypt, reinforcing our search for Mideast peace.

—26% would go to base-rights countries such as the Philippines, Greece and Turkey, and military-access states such as Kenya, Korea and Pakistan.

—11% would go to Central America and the Caribbean.

—17% would go to countries who share our democratic values such as Colombia and India; where new democracies have emerged such as Bolivia and Uruguay; and where basic economic reforms are occurring such as Ecuador and Senegal.

The funding cuts that Congress would have us absorb would require us to turn our backs on critical countries in Africa and the Middle East when their need for U.S. support has never been greater. The resulting void in strategic areas encourages our adversaries to fill in behind us.

It would cost the U.S. many times the \$800 million Mr. Shaw claims we would save to replace the bases we could lose by "shaving" our security assistance. The political costs are equally daunting. Standing with the U.S. and supporting Western security interests can be risky. How do we explain to Egypt and Morocco that budget cuts are "inevitable" in light of the dangers they face because they are working with the U.S. toward peace in the Middle East? If countries support publicly U.S. interests and in return see they must stand alone as we work out our sums in the budget game Mr. Shaw would have us play, how can we advance our foreign-policy interests?

JOHN C. WHITEHEAD,

Deputy Secretary, State Department.

COMMEMORATIVE GOLD AND
SILVER COINS IN CELEBRATION
OF THE 100TH CONGRESS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in January 1987, the 100th Congress of the United States will convene. This occasion will be a milestone not only for this institution, but for American constitutional and representative Government. Our two-century experiment in democracy has revealed that the legislative branch, especially the House of Representatives, is what one Member called "a mirror in which the American people can see themselves."

Like the U.S. population, Congress has exhibited tremendous historical growth in its size and workload. The Senate's size is, of course, fixed by the number of States regardless of population; in fact, this is the only provision of the Constitution which cannot be altered without the express consent of all the States. Through the 19th century, the House expanded somewhat erratically, with its greatest periods of growth occurring in the first two decades of the Republic and again immediately following the Civil War. Both Houses have apparently attained their ultimate size: since 1910, only Alaska and Hawaii have been added, and the House has remained constant at 435 Members—with a brief interval at 437 immediately following the admission of Alaska and Hawaii.

Looking at the first Congress through modern eyes, one is struck by the relatively small circles of people involved. The House of Representatives, that "impetuous council," was in 1789 composed of 65 Members—when all of them showed up. The aristocratic Senate boasted only 26 Members, two from each of the original 13 States.

Growth has profoundly affected the work of Congress. It compelled the House to develop strong leaders, to rely heavily on its committees, to impose strict limits on floor debate, and to devise elaborate ways of channeling the flow of floor business. It is no accident that strong leaders emerged during the House's rapid growth periods. After the initial growth spurt of the first two decades of the Republic, vigorous leadership appeared in the person of Henry Clay, whose speakership—1811-14, 1815-20, 1823-25—demonstrated the potential of that office. Similarly, post-Civil War growth was accompanied by an era of strong speakers lasting from the 1870's until 1910. Size is not the only impetus for strong leadership, but it tends to centralize procedural control.

In the smaller and more intimate Senate, the evolution has been more gradual. The relative informality of Senate procedures, not to mention the long-cherished right of unlimited debate, testify to the loose reins of leadership. Compared with the House's elaborate system of rules and precedents, the Senate's rules are relatively brief and simple. Informal negotiations among Senators interested in a given measure prevail, and debate is typically regulated by unanimous-consent agreements engineered by the parties' floor leaders.

This spectacular growth—in number of people and in bricks and mortar—has profoundly altered the operation of Congress as a representative assembly. Whereas once Members dealt with each other directly on a daily basis when Congress was in session, they often interact today through staff aides and complicated organizational arrangements. Informal relationships have been replaced by rules, procedures, and precedents. In short, Congress has shifted perceptibly from a small, unified, corporate body to one that has a bureaucratic character—with all of the trappings of size, complexity, specialization, and routinization.

During the Republic's early days, the Government at Washington was, as the authors of Federalist 22 put it, "at a distance and out of

sight." Lawmaking was a part-time occupation. As President John F. Kennedy was fond of remarking, the Clays, Calhouns, and Websters of the 19th century could afford to devote a whole generation or more to debating and refining the great controversies at hand. During the 1920's, as recalled by Representative Joseph W. Martin, of Massachusetts, the most pressing issue considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee during one session was a \$20,000 authorization for an international poultry show in Tulsa, OK.

Even in the 1950's, the legislative schedule was quite manageable, as indicated in Speaker Samuel Rayburn's description of a Representative's ideal day's activities:

The average Member will come down to the office around 8 or 8:30. He spends his time with visitors until around 10 o'clock, then he goes to a committee meeting, and when the committee adjourns he comes to the House of Representatives, or should, and stays around the House Chamber and listens.

Needless to say, the days of a single morning committee hearing and time to witness the entire floor proceedings in the afternoon are long gone. Conflicting committee sessions and snatches of floor deliberations are now the order of the day.

Congress' workload—once limited in scope, small in volume, and simple in content—has grown to staggering proportions. In general, the number of measures introduced and passed has risen, as has the number of committee and subcommittee meetings and the number of hours Congress is in session. By every measure—hours in session, committee meetings, floor votes—the congressional workload just about doubled in the 20 years between 1957 and 1977, though it has since declined.

In the face of a workload expanding both in quantity and breadth of subject matter, Congress responded by restricting the depth of its involvement—mainly by concentrating on fewer but more complex issues; it delegated more decisions to executive-branch agents, and shifted its own role to that of monitor, vetoer, and overseer. The proliferation of reporting requirements, legislative approval and veto provisions, and oversight activities testified to this strategic shift. Congress eventually countered this heightened dependence upon the Executive in the wake of the Vietnam and Watergate crises by striving to regain control it had delegated away. This legislative resurgence, marked by the 1973 war powers resolution and the 1974 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, has substantially restrained the tendency toward Presidential excess.

Embracing John Locke's doctrine that "the legislative is not only the supreme power, but is sacred and unalterable in the hands where the community have placed it," the Constitution vests all legislative powers in Congress, the first branch of Government. The breathtaking array of powers granted to the legislative branch reflects the framers' view of the legislature as the chief repository of governmental powers. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which enumerates Congress' powers, expresses the framers' vision of a vigorous

legislature as a keystone of energetic government.

Raising and spending money for governmental purposes lies at the heart of Congress' prerogatives. The "power of the purse" was the lever by which parliaments historically gained bargaining advantages over kings. The Constitution's authors, well aware of this, gave Congress full power of the purse. There are two components of this power: taxing and spending.

Financing the Government is carried out under a broad mandate in article I, section 8: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Although this wording covered all known forms of taxing, there were limitations: taxes had to be uniform throughout the country; duties were prohibited on goods traveling between States; and "capitation * * * or other direct" taxes were prohibited, unless levied according to population, article I, section 9. This last provision proved controversial, especially when the Supreme Court held in 1895—*Pollock versus Farmers' Loan and Trust Co.* that it applied to taxes on incomes. To overcome this confusion, the 16th amendment, ratified 18 years later, explicitly conferred the power to levy income taxes.

Congressional power over Government spending is no less sweeping than revenue power. According to article I, section 9, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." This is one of the legislature's most potent weapons in overseeing the executive branch.

Congress possesses potentially broad powers over the Nation's economic and political well-being. It may coin money, incur debts, and regulate commerce. It may establish post offices, build post roads, and issue patents and copyrights. It has the duty of specifying the size of the Supreme Court and of establishing lower Federal courts. It has the power to provide for a militia and call it forth to repeal invasions or suppress rebellions.

Congress plays a key role in foreign relations with its sole powers of declaring war, ratifying treaties, raising and supporting armies, providing and maintaining a navy, and making rules governing the military forces. Finally, Congress is vested with the power "to make laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers," article I, section 8.

Article I established two legislative bodies: the House of Representatives, section 2, whose powers were to be derived from the American people; and the Senate, section 3, whose powers were to be derived from the States. In this sense, as explained in Federalist 39, the House of Representatives would be a national body, the Senate a Federal body. Article I of the Constitution assigned Congress a mix of attributes, some national in character, some of a Federal character. The multiple character of congressional powers contributed to a ratification consensus, as well as to the elaborate system of checks and balances woven throughout the Constitution.

This constitutionally endowed dual character, national and Federal, shapes Congress'

central challenge or dilemma. Congress is charged with two great functions, representation and legislation, which are not always neatly compatible. There are times, for both individual Members of Congress and the institution as a whole, when tension ensues from our efforts to serve as both a representative assembly and a law-making body. Inevitably there are occasions when the short-term attitudes or priorities of our individual constituencies are in conflict with long-range national interests. The difficulty in objectively assessing long-range interests further complicates the dilemma of formulating responsible public policy while expressing the concerns of our geographic constituencies.

In our 200 years of constitutional democracy, the United States has matured from a largely homogeneous agrarian Nation of seemingly endless natural frontiers to an increasingly heterogeneous industrial, technological and cultural international leader. Congressional actions more often have paved the way for individual and national progress and recognized the need for concerted action in response to constituent, Federal, national, and international problems.

In the House of Representatives, planning and direction for the coming bicentennial commemoration is in the hands of the Commission on the U.S. House of Representatives Bicentenary, created in 1985 and chaired by our colleague, LINDY BOGGS. Implementing these plans will be the responsibility of the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives, under the direction of Dr. Raymond W. Smock. These are being aided by experts from the Congressional Research Service, the Senate Historical Office, and other agencies.

The coming bicentennial celebration is not only an occasion for praising the Founders' wisdom and taking comfort from the success of our achievement. It is also an opportunity to reflect seriously on the continuing challenges that face our legislative institutions. It is sobering to remember that our Congress, based on 18th century principles of representation, was created for a world very different from the one we live in today. Far older than most of the world's present governments, our constitutional structure was invented before the industrial revolution, before mass production and space flight, before computers and television, before penicillin and genetic engineering and before Hiroshima and Auschwitz.

The survival of this representative system shows its resilience in the face of such changes. Yet people have always questioned whether representative assemblies, composed of generalists elected from separate geographic areas, can cope with the vexing challenge of finding and expressing the common good. In many respects, today's challenges are more awesome, and the margin of error more narrow, than at any time in our history.

In the coming weeks I will present a series of statements reflecting on the 100th Congress. These statements will recall the first Congress, will highlight some of the most memorable achievements during the first 99 Congresses, and will address Congress' present state and future role. The 100th Congress provides a particularly appropriate occasion for us to reflect and contemplate this in-

stitution's past and future efforts to fulfill its constitutional charge.

As we in Congress and citizens throughout the Nation begin our celebration of this historic event, it is particularly appropriate that the Congress authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a gold coin in commemoration of the 100th Congress. This legislation, which I am introducing today, will authorize the minting and issuing of both \$5 gold coins and \$1 silver coins in commemoration of the 100th Congress. These coins are to be used as legal tender, and the design on the coins will be selected in consultation with the Commission of the Fine Arts. I hope that you will join me in cosponsoring this historic commemorative legislation honoring this great legislative body.

CRUSADE AGAINST DRUG ABUSE

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit, for the RECORD, the best five essays on drug abuse written by sixth grade students from the 21st Congressional District of Illinois. I would also like to commend the teachers for their devotion and patience in educating and developing our youth of today for their future of tomorrow.

Monte Cope, East Middle School, Alton, IL.

What I would do if offered drugs:

If someone offered me drugs, I would say "no!" I don't want to ruin in my life what a lot of people have ruined in theirs. I want to keep my life as healthy as possible. I don't want to destroy what I've got. If I'm lonely, I play with my puppies. If I'm upset or unhappy I talk to my mom. If someone should offer you drugs, say "No" to drugs and "Yes" to your life!

As a good citizen, how I can help my community:

I would like to help my community by telling children and parents about how dangerous drugs can be. I'd set up a drug abuser plan. If a person needs help, they can call a number and make an appointment. I'd try to give them help. We should make drug detectors and search forests, abandoned houses, club houses and old hangouts for drugs and make more shows like Miami Vice.

Leslie Stavely, Parkview Elementary School, Granite City, IL.

What I would do if offered drugs:

If I was offered drugs, I would say NO! If you take drugs, you're just wasting your life away. You're killing your self everytime you take that one little puff, or that one little pill. So if anybody tries to push me into taking drugs, I would say NO!

As a good citizen, how I can help my community:

As a good citizen, I can help my community by not taking drugs. If I knew anyone who took drugs, I would encourage them to try to quit. I would help them in their hard times. I would also encourage my friends to say NO!

Rebecca Thompson, Webster Elementary School, Collinsville, IL.

What I would do if offered drugs:

If I were offered drugs as many of my peers have, I would say NO. That's all. Sometimes people take NO for an answer without any questions. I've never been offered drugs before but people who take them think they've escaped their problems. I think drugs stink!

As a good citizen, how I can help my community:

As a good citizen of Collinsville I'd look around to see if anyone is using drugs. If they are, I turn them in immediately. I wouldn't want a high teen-ager behind the wheel of a car, killing some innocent person. It happens much too often.

Dawn Renee Pattison, St. Boniface School, Edwardsville, IL.

What I would do if offered drugs:

If offered drugs, I'm probably one person who could honestly say "no." I like my life the way it is. I don't need it messed up by something artificial. Love is all we need, and if more people knew that, then who knows how much better the world would be.

As a good citizen, how I can help my community:

I could help my community by passing flyers out at the carnivals and public places. I could also put up a display at the library with my friends. Another thing I could do is to keep my friends from doing drugs

Noel Howard, Rosewood School, E. Alton, IL.

What I would do if offered drugs:

If someone told me drugs were neat. And they'd give me a feeling nothing could beat.

I'd tell them "No!" and go away.

Then I'd leave, that's all I'd say.

I don't think it's "cool" to take coke or pot. . . .

You'd just be the dope you are taking or got!

As a good citizen, how I can help my community:

To be a good citizen, I'd try to help out

By obeying laws and going about

Helping my community stay clean.

I won't vandalize and won't be mean.

I want my community to be nice and fit.

Since it helps me, I'll help it.

SOME BANKS SUPPORT CREDIT CARD RATE DISCLOSURE

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the Banking Committee recently approved legislation that requires detailed disclosure of interest rates and fees in all bank credit card solicitations.

This legislation will provide long overdue protection to the consumer, and it is interesting to note that a number of financial institutions are supporting this approach.

I recently came across an op-ed column by John R. Underwood, president of the First Wisconsin Bank of Green Bay, supporting credit card disclosure legislation introduced by Representative TOBY ROTH, one of the principal authors of the legislation accepted in the Banking Committee.

The text of the article follows:

[From the Green Bay (WI) Press-Gazette, July 26, 1986]

DISCLOSURE LAW NEEDED FOR CREDIT CARD SOLICITORS

(By John R. Underwood)

Last year, the average Wisconsin family received 18 solicitations for MasterCard or Visa bank credit cards from out-of-state credit card issuers.

To date, about 15 percent of the state's households have accepted those offers. But how many knew the costs they were incurring when they signed up for an out-of-state credit card?

These solicitations typically opened with the exciting pronouncement, "A new credit card with a \$5,000 credit line has been reserved in your name."

Very few of these solicitations included information on the annual fee charged for the card, its interest rate or any other charges involved. These consumers were not informed of the cost of the cards until they had agreed to accept one. Does that sound like a good business practice to you?

We at First Wisconsin, along with many other Wisconsin financial institutions, think that's putting the cart before the horse. People should be informed of how much a credit card is going to cost them before they decide whether to take it.

That's why we support a bill proposed by Rep. Toby Roth, R-Wis., that would require earlier disclosure of credit card costs.

The current disclosure law, the Truth in Lending Act, in effect enables credit card issuers to "close the sale" before stating the terms of the agreement, which typically include higher interest rates and annual fees than can be obtained locally.

Roth has introduced a bill that would require the creditor to clearly disclose the costs involved in all applications or solicitations for a credit card plan.

Consumers deserve to be given all pertinent information regarding open-end credit card plans up front, and the information should be stated in easily understandable terms. This information should include annual interest rates, annual fees and any other charges the card may carry.

As it stands, Wisconsin is the only state in the nation to have a law (Act 244) requiring the formal disclosure of credit information on every application or solicitation for an open-end credit plan. This also includes applications in an advertisement.

Wisconsin's law will require the disclosure of annual interest rates, annual fees and any other costs of the card. The requirements of Act 244, which goes into effect Jan. 1, 1987, will apply to all credit card issuers doing business in the state.

But the state faces an uphill battle in trying to get out-of-state credit card issuers to comply with its requirements when soliciting in Wisconsin.

As it is, they have managed to get around the disclosure requirements outlined in the federal Truth in Lending law by keeping their solicitations—usually direct mail offers—very vague. By not stating any credit terms at all, they are not subject to disclosure requirements.

By not stating the costs involved up front, these issuers make their cards sound appealing, persuading customers to sign up for them even though they may already carry a bank credit card and may be ill-advised to apply for additional credit.

Roth's bill currently is being reviewed by the House Consumer Affairs and Coinage subcommittee, which is expected to pass on the bill, or a variation, for further consideration by the House.

Congress is said to be inclined to pass a bill requiring more stringent disclosure laws. Such a bill is expected to be passed by Oct. 1.

We hope consumers will be more aware of the dangers of overextending their credit if they are informed of all the costs a credit card imposes before they sign up for the card. We urge Congress to follow the lead of Wisconsin in requiring early and easily understood disclosure of credit card costs.

A TRIBUTE TO THE INFORMATION CENTER FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of the Information Center for Handicapped Individuals, Inc. [ICHI] a public interest, community-based, nonprofit agency designed as the protection and advocacy system for both developmentally disabled individuals and individuals with mental illness, who reside in the District of Columbia, as mandated by Public Law 98-527 and Public Law 99-319, respectively.

The information center has had, as its primary purpose since its inception in 1969, the representation of, and advocacy for, the interests, needs, and rights of handicapped individuals.

On September 12, 1986, the Information Center for Handicapped Individuals will hold its annual conference at the Washington Convention Center. This year's theme is "Expanding the Commitment to Advocacy."

Dr. Jean Elder, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, is the keynote speaker, and will set the tone for the conference. Morning panelists also include Ms. Audrey Rowe, commissioner, commission on social services, and Dr. Reed Tuckson, acting commissioner, commission on public health, DC Department of Human Services.

The morning workshops will address issues in special education; the AIDS crisis; and client assistance in vocational rehabilitation. Afternoon workshops will focus on special education, employment discrimination, and Social Security disability. The luncheon speakers include Ms. Cathy Hughes, president and general manager of WOL-AM; and Mr. Steven Schwartz, Esq., director for the Center of Public Representation.

The first annual Roland J. Queen, Sr. Memorial Award will be presented to Mr. Vincent Gray, executive director of the District of Columbia Association for Retarded Citizens. Ms. Angela Owens, editorial director of WRC-TV4 News, is to be mistress of ceremonies. Ms. Eva Britt, Ms. Wheelchair D.C. 1986, will also be in attendance.

The executive director of the Information Center for Handicapped Individuals, Inc. is

Mrs. Yetta W. Galiber. Under her direction, the center produces the following publications: the Directory of Services for Handicapped Conditions, a contemporary and exhaustive directory of services for handicapped conditions; Access Washington, a guide to metropolitan Washington for physically disabled individuals containing information on accessibility of recreation facilities, restaurants, sites of interest, and theaters; and Here Comes the Sun, a directory of summer programs for handicapped children and adults.

In 1971, Mrs. Galiber initiated the Christmas Store for needy handicapped children. Last year, more than 8,000 children came to the store and purchased toys with play money. The center also sponsors the Ms. Wheelchair D.C. Pageant, which recognizes the accomplishments of disabled women in the District of Columbia, despite the attitudinal and architectural barriers which confront them.

The information center is planning a fund-raising campaign next spring. I urge all my colleagues and the residents of the District of Columbia, its business and industries, to join me by helping to raise the consciousness of this Capitol City, by supporting the information center's efforts, so the center can expand and continue its fine work.

BIRMINGHAM SOUTHERN'S NEAL BERTE NAMED "DISTINGUISHED LEADER"

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, the president of Birmingham-Southern College, Dr. Neal Berte, is well known across the State of Alabama, as well as nationally, for his selfless dedication to the education of our young people. He has taken a leadership role in improving even further an already highly regarded liberal arts school. During his tenure, Birmingham-Southern has doubled its enrollment, doubled its endowment to some \$22.5 million, raised more than \$30 million in new moneys to fund capital improvements and general college needs, and been cited in several national publications for the excellent educational opportunities it offers.

Dr. Berte has been the recipient of many academic honors and awards, including a Ford Foundation Scholar, Rockefeller Foundation Fellow, and Omicron Delta Kappa National Scholarship winner. He was selected from literally thousands who were nominated for consideration as one of this Nation's top 100 emerging leaders in higher education in a national survey by the American Council on Education and Change Magazine, and named college "Administrator of the Year" in Alabama by the American Association of University Administrators in 1981.

But while Neal Berte is noted for his impressive academic and professional background, the educational community is not alone in reaping the benefits that are offered by his zeal for learning and zest for life. Dr. Berte somehow manages to make time in an all-too-busy schedule to serve on a number of civic

and community-oriented organizations, including chairing the Steering Committee for Leadership Birmingham, serving as board member for the Boy Scouts, Alabama Symphony, Chamber of Commerce, Operation New Birmingham, the Jefferson-Shelby Counties Lung Association, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the American Heart Association, to mention only a few.

In recognition of his commitment to community involvement, Dr. Berte was selected to receive yet another award, the "Distinguished Leader's Award," which was presented to him by the National Association of Community Leadership Organization (NACLO) at its annual conference in Indianapolis on September 7-9.

Our fate as a Nation may well depend on how prepared our young people will be to face the challenges that will surely lie before them in the years to come. Dr. Neal Berte has been, and remains, totally committed to making certain that our youth receive the best education possible. And the priority he places on community involvement is a shining example to our young people of the importance of volunteerism and community service.

All of our lives have been made better as a result of Dr. Neal Berte's educational and community involvement. I am certain my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating him for his selection to receive the "Distinguished Leader's Award," and commending him for his good work.

BOROUGH OF SPOTSWOOD, NJ, ENDORSES PRESIDENT'S COUNTERTERROR ACTION

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the bloody crimes of several days ago in Pakistan and Turkey should remind us just how long Europe has been quiet. That period of calm began on April 14 when, after years of provocation, President Reagan ordered retaliation for Libyan-assisted international terrorist attacks. The subsequent respite we won was well deserved.

But the air raid on Libya was somewhat controversial. Many American opinionmakers reiterated the view that it would only bring bloodier counterattacks, and the Arab opinion would rally to the side of Colonel Qadhafi. Some of us argued then—and we can certainly tell now—that none of that is true. The air raid was a sweeping success, and if Libya or other states perpetuate their politics of murdering innocent civilians to make "political statements" then another like it might become necessary.

Among those who saw events clearly after April 14 were the county officers of the Borough of Spotswood in Middlesex County, N.J. I wish to record their view—and their vision—by submitting for today's RECORD the text of the resolution they approved in a meeting of May 1986, and forwarded to me under the signature of Reggie Pasterczyk, clerk of the borough.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, acts of terrorism around the globe present a continuing threat to all innocent world residents, and

Whereas, acts of the Libyan government have not only condoned, but have actually fostered global terrorism; and

Whereas, our President, Ronald Reagan, has taken necessary and warranted action to express our Country's complete opposition to terrorist acts; and

Whereas the citizens of Spotswood, as part of the world community strongly support the actions of our President: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Borough Council of the Borough of Spotswood, County of Middlesex, New Jersey, That:

1. We fully support the actions of our President in dealing with Libya; and

2. Copies of this resolution be sent to President Reagan, Senator Bradley, Senator Lautenberg and Congressman Courter.

SOUTH FLORIDA-NEVADA LAND EXCHANGE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked our colleague from Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, to add my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 5435, legislation to authorize an exchange of lands owned by the Aerojet Corp. in south Dade County, FL, for federally owned lands in Nevada. The Florida lands would then be sold to the South Florida Water Management District, with the proceeds to be used for land acquisition in U.S. wildlife refuges in Florida.

This land exchange would appear to be good for all concerned. Aerojet would gain land it needs to proceed with rocket development for our Nation's defense; the Department of the Interior will obtain revenue for the purchase of lands necessary for the preservation of endangered wildlife; and the State of Florida will become owner of property immediately east of Everglades National Park which could otherwise have been subject to development. It is my understanding that the water management district, which administers the central and southern Florida flood control project for the Army Corps of Engineers, plans to flood this area as a means of relieving excess water in the park.

Mr. Speaker, all of these uses are laudable and for the public good and it is for this reason that I am cosponsoring the legislation. However, I do want to go on record as expressing my sincere hope that nothing in this legislation should be interpreted as an intent to reduce or eliminate flood protection for agricultural or residential properties in the area. Forty percent of the Nation's winter tomatoes are grown by four companies on land north of that being exchanged. These companies were formerly located in the area known as the Hole-in-the-Doughnut of Everglades National Park and were asked to leave by the Department of the Interior following a determination, with which I agreed, that farming was not a compatible activity in the park. However, having relocated some 10 to 15 years ago,

there remains nowhere else for these growers to go should their land become unarable as a result of increased water levels caused by flooding to the south.

Not only would this be an infringement of private property rights—an issue on which the growers have already sought judicial relief—but a substantial amount of our Nation's winter tomato supply would be gravely affected. Those administering the lands to be acquired must work in a spirit of cooperation to ensure that an action that has great benefit for one natural resource does not cancel itself out by adversely impacting on another.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. JACK WATKINS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, few functions of the Federal Government are as important as our national defense, and few organizations have contributed as significantly to our national defense as the U.S. Air Force Strategic Air Command. For the past 6 years, the 1st Strategic Aerospace Division of SAC, headquartered at Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA, has been commanded by Maj. Gen. Jack L. Watkins. This year, General Watkins will step down after 35 years of service in the U.S. Armed Forces.

During his years of command at Vandenberg, General Watkins has led the base to numerous awards from the Department of Defense and the Air Force. In addition, he and his wife, Mary Ann, have been heavily involved in local community support and activities. Under his direction, the Central Coast United Way raised a record amount of contributions for public service agencies in Santa Barbara County, and relations between the base and the local communities of Lompoc and Santa Maria, as well as the County of Santa Barbara, reached even higher levels of cooperation and mutual support. Indeed, Vandenberg under General Watkins and his predecessors has been more than a neighbor, it is an integral part of the community and the 19th District of California.

As commander of "I STRAD," as it is known, General Watkins is responsible for directing all SAC missile combat crew training; controlling and conducting SAC ballistic missile operational testing; and providing host base support for all tenants at Vandenberg, including Air Force Systems Command, Military Airlift Command, and Air Force Communications Command.

General Watkins, a native of Pittsburgh, PA, entered the army in 1946, qualifying as a parachutist and gliderist before separating in 1948 to attend college. He was recalled to active duty during the Korean conflict and served with anti-aircraft units as a battery executive officer and commander in the United States and Germany before returning to the University of Pittsburgh and receiving his bachelor's degree in 1954. In 1955, he received a direct commission as a lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force, graduated from pilot train-

ing and served until 1961 with the Tactical Air Command and Military Air Transport Service. Subsequent assignments included headquarters U.S. Air Force in Washington, DC; Bolling Air Force Base; U.S. Army Command and General Staff College; Joint Task Force Two in Albuquerque, NM; Industrial College of the Armed Forces; professor of aerospace studies at the University of Pittsburgh; and vice commandant, Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps.

In 1973, he was named vice commander and acting commander of the 416th Bombardment Wing, K.I. Sawyer AFB, MI, and in 1974 commanded the 416th Bombardment Wing at Griffiss AFB, NY. In 1975, he assumed command of the 45th Air Division at Pease Air Force Base, NH, before being assigned to SAC headquarters at Offutt AFB, NE, where he served as deputy chief of staff, operations. In 1979, General Watkins became vice commander, 15th Air Force, with headquarters at March AFB CA, assuming command at Vandenberg in November 1970.

General Watkins is a command pilot with more than 10,000 flying hours in 26 different types of aircraft. He wears the master missile, gliderist, parachutist, and space badges. His military decorations and awards include the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal, and Air Force Commendation Medal.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the 19th District are proud of the record of Vandenberg AFB under General Watkins, and grateful for the role he has played both as base commander and active citizen in the local community. We wish Jack and Mary Ann well in their future endeavors, and know that they will continue to have many valued friends and associations in the community they have served so well. In conclusion, I would like to add my own thanks and that of my wife Norma in appreciation to our friends Jack and Mary Ann for their many years of service to our country in both their public and private roles. I know my colleagues in the Congress join me.

NATIONAL CPR AWARENESS WEEK

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to designate the week of October 19 through 25, 1986, as "National CPR Awareness Week." By focusing public awareness on this simple first aid procedure, we could reduce the number of heart attack deaths by promoting the CPR training program in the United States.

Heart attacks are the leading cause of death in the United States, and as many as 1.5 million people will suffer a heart attack in 1986. I am sorry to say that nearly half of these people will die. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation is a life-saving procedure and it could prevent many of these deaths, if only more people knew how to perform it. With the success that fire and rescue departments and

many trained individuals have had in saving lives that would otherwise have been lost due to heart attacks, it is vital that we maximize public participation in CPR training.

National CPR Awareness Week is an ideal way to encourage more people to sign up for CPR training classes. I urge my colleagues to join me by supporting this resolution which will help State and local heart associations work with the public to reduce the number of heart attack deaths in our country.

A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE AND GLADYS BROOKS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this coming weekend, the National Commission on Human Rights for our Prisoners of War and Missing in Action in Southeast Asia are going to honor two outstanding Americans who have devoted their lives to assuring that our missing heroes in Southeast Asia are not forgotten.

In fact, it is no exaggeration to state that no one has done more for this cause than have George and Gladys Brooks of New Windsor, NY.

George and Gladys became involved in the cause of our POW/MIA's during the early 1970's; in fact, while the Vietnamese conflict was still in progress. They kept the issue alive before the Nixon administration, and at that time cofounded the National League of Families. It was through their efforts that the majority of American prisoners were freed in January 1973.

Throughout the Ford and Carter administrations, the Brooks' continued their commitment, traveling to and from Washington at their own expense to remind our Nation of the need for a full accounting. They even travelled to Southeast Asia to follow any and every lead. Those were frustrating times for all of us involved with this issue, but the hopes and determination of George and Gladys Brooks have kept their faith alive in all our hearts.

Although George and Gladys' own son, Nicholas, was missing in action in 1970 in Southeast Asia, it was not his capture that initially prompted their involvement in this issue. A full year prior to the disappearance of his own son, the Brooks' became involved in the quest for Joseph Mobley, a friend and classmate of their son. As it turned out, Joe Mobley came marching home, but for 12 long years the Brooks' did not know the fate of their own son, Nick, who was shot down over Laos.

It was March 1982 when the long wait ended for George and Gladys Brooks. The remains of their son were finally returned to them. But their commitment did not end. George remained as chairman of the board of the National League of Families, and they both continued to devote themselves to the cause of our POW's and MIA's since.

In great part, the calm, reasoned yet determined leadership of the Brooks' have led our current administration to give top priority to a full accounting of our missing American heroes.

At the time their son's remains were returned home, a local newspaper quoted a neighbor of the Brooks; marveling at their total commitment. "It wasn't something they went around and said anything about. They were on a hectic schedule. You'd invite them over and they'd get a phone call and have to leave. That's how they lived their lives."

In the intervening years, the Brooks' commitment only increased.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join with us in paying tribute to a truly fine couple, outstanding Americans, George and Gladys Brooks of New Windsor, NY.

JEMEZ PUEBLO FIREFIGHTERS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I bring to your attention an article from Indian News Notes, a publication of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Four members of a fire fighting crew from the Jemez Pueblo in New Mexico were killed August 24 when a National Guard truck carrying the exhausted crew back to base camp went off the road and overturned. Two other members of the crew suffered major injuries, and seven were moderately injured with fractures. The Indian crew had been fighting an 18,000-acre fire in the Boise National Forest. The newspaper USA Today said of the four that they "died upholding the long tradition of Native Americans serving as the elite of the USA's wildfire fighters." The 2,000-population Jemez Pueblo was in mourning August 25 and outsiders were barred from entering. Fire fighter Al Waque commented, "If one family grieves, we all grieve because we're all related to each other. We are all brothers and sisters." More than 2,000 of the 16,000 fire fighters battling blazes in six northern western states in August are Indians. George Leech, an Arizona fire-training officer said, "I think the Indian crews are among the better ones. They seem to have a better level of endurance." He added, "They are a lot more tied to the earth. The resources still mean something to them." Paul Tosa, a Jemez tribal leader, told USA Today that among the fire fighters "there is very much pride. They are very special people."

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all of my colleagues in the House to join me in saluting the heroic efforts of the Jemez Pueblo firefighters, and expressing our grief for their tragic loss. My condolences go to the families and friends of these heroes.

INTRODUCTION OF MYASTENIA GRAVIS WEEK RESOLUTION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again to introduce a resolution that designates the week of October 12 as "Myasthenia Gravis Week." This resolution is for the recognition of a most serious health threat

that as yet has not been conquered. Many of the Members of this most honored body supported this resolution last year and I would urge them to do so again.

Myasthenia Gravis, also known as Erb-Goldfarn disease, is a neuromuscular disease which has affected up to 300,000 Americans of both sexes, all ages and all races. MG affects neither the muscle nor the nerve, but the synapse—the gap between the nerve and the muscle which conducts the electrical current from the nerve to the muscle.

Myasthenia Gravis can strike any area of the body at any time. Because Mr. Speaker, it is such an unpredictable disease, it is often misdiagnosed as chronic fatigue, which allows the disease to progress until the victim is in severe danger. Until recently, MG has been fatal for 85 percent of its victims. There is still no prevention or cure, but significant progress has been made.

The establishment of Myasthenia Gravis Week, from October 12 to 18, will call attention to the serious problems MG victims face each day. This increased awareness will not only make potential victims more sensitive to the symptoms and the dangers of this serious disease but will also lead to increased research in the quest for a cure. The successes that we have been experiencing in solving the problems attendant with other such diseases should give us all heart that resolutions such as this, do make a difference in the fight against these diseases.

I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in approving this resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, I intended to vote in favor of final passage of H.R. 3129, but I am recorded as having voted against passage. I would like the record to show that I did, in fact, support passage.

SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH RALLY

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, today thousands of senior citizens from all over the country have come to our Nation's Capital to rally against the Social Security notch provision. I would like take a moment to commend all of them for their unwavering commitment to this most worthy cause. These and thousands of other senior citizens are sending a clear message to Congress that the present inequity in Social Security benefits will not be tolerated.

The "Notch Babies" continue to have my full support on this issue. Because of the notch provision, workers born between 1917 and 1921 receive significantly lower benefits

than those born before those years. In some cases, the differences in benefits can add up to more than \$1,000 a year. For American retirees on fixed incomes, this situation is flatly unfair.

That is why I have consistently supported legislation which would correct this injustice. The notch provision is a result of changes made in 1977 to the Social Security benefit formula. The 1972 benefit formula overcompensated for inflation. However, the 1977 amendments underestimated inflation and ignored the post-age 61 earnings of the "Notch Babies." Those affected by the notch provision have been unfairly penalized as a result of the 1977 amendments.

I am very pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1917, which would eliminate the notch problem and insure that all our senior citizens will be fairly compensated for their lifetime contribution to our great Nation. I realize how important these benefits are to millions of Americans. Our senior citizens deserve our utmost respect and support. They are calling on all of us here in Congress to take action to correct this unfair situation. Let's join together to repeal the Social Security notch provision.

TRIBUTE TO COL. RICHARD SAVOIR

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the retirement of Col. Richard Savoir from the West Point Liaison Program where he has served for the past 14 years.

Colonel Savoir graduated from Southern University and was commissioned as second lieutenant on active duty with the 8th Army ordnance inspection team in Korea. Following his term of active duty, Colonel Savoir attended Columbia Teachers College and State University of New York at Stony Brook, where he received master's degrees in teaching. While pursuing his career as a teacher, Colonel Savoir was active in the Army Reserves. In 1972, Colonel Savoir joined the Liaison Program at West Point where he has served for the past 14 years.

Because of his outstanding service both in and out of the military, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I salute Colonel Savoir on his retirement. I personally wish Colonel Savoir the best of luck for the future.

SALUTE TO LINDEN, NJ, INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to bring to the attention of the Congress the fine work and many contributions of the Linden Industrial Association which was incorporated in 1935 to promote the mutual interests of industries in Linden and surrounding areas.

Over the past 50 years, the member companies, through their concern and enthusiasm, have fulfilled the goals set forth by the association's founders. The Linden Industrial Association has established itself as a vital part of the community, working to enhance local commerce and improve the quality of life for all citizens.

The organization symbolizes what can be achieved when small businesses and large companies combine their talents and energies in the pursuit of common goals. Our towns, the State of New Jersey, and the entire Nation benefit from this high level of dedication and effort. The association's members, both past and present, are to be commended for their excellent work and genuine sense of civic awareness.

The Linden Industrial Association has provided invaluable input on local issues, always striving to keep our communities safe and strong, and area businesses thriving. This spirit of cooperation and commitment has yielded benefits manifold and a private and public sector partnership that has been enormously successful. As the Linden Industrial Association enters the 21st century, it will continue to provide crucial leadership in the sustained development of local commerce and keeping our communities vibrant. I salute the association for its fine work.

H.M.S. RICHARDS MEMORIAL BANQUET

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1986, the Greater Glendale Chapter of the Committee of 500 of the Voice of Prophecy will host a memorial banquet in honor of Elder H.M.S. Richards, a pioneer radio evangelist.

The event is a fundraiser for the Voice of Prophecy, which was started by Elder Richards in 1930. For more than five decades, Elder Richards labored and loved. He then turned "the Voice" over to his son, Elder H.M.S. Richards, Jr.

Today, the Voice of Prophecy broadcasts Christian programs to 80 countries around the world. In North America, programs are aired daily over hundreds of radio stations.

The central message of the organization is that man must care for man if his community, his country, his kindred are to be successful. This Christian theme was placed at the core of the Voice of Prophecy by its founder who died a short while ago. In his absence, his son carries the cause and the theme onward. The memorial banquet is an effort of caring friends who want to support and nurture the organization and the idea. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce this kind of event to my friends in the House of Representatives.

BROOKVILLE—NO. 1 COMMUNITY OF THE YEAR IN PENNSYLVANIA

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Brookville, PA, will be recognized on September 29 as the 1986 "Pennsylvania Community of the Year" by the State chamber of commerce. Because Brookville is located in my congressional district and because I travel there frequently, I can see why the borough was selected for this outstanding honor.

In selecting the outstanding community in Pennsylvania, the State chamber considers a number of factors, such as a community's contributions to business and commerce in the State, its ability to generate new jobs, stimulate public and private investment and develop working partnerships between business and government.

Brookville, with a population of 4,500, impressed the selection committee for a number of reasons.

It has a nationally recognized Main Street project which generated \$3 million in private investment and created 30 new jobs.

It successfully completed a \$1.19 million drive to build a new hospital.

It raised over \$600,000 of private money to refurbish the local YMCA, making Brookville the smallest community in the Nation with a full service YMCA.

Chamber officials said they were impressed with Brookville's ability to use small amounts of public capital and larger amounts of private investment to "stimulate new projects and revitalize the downtown, preparing their community for the future," according to an editorial in the DuBois Courier-Express.

The editorial went on to applaud the "Brookville spirit," adding that "other depressed communities in the area undergoing similar renaissance efforts should maintain the same spirit that brought Brookville success."

I know that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Brookville for being selected as the 1986 "Pennsylvania Community of the Year" and wish the borough's residents continued success in making Brookville a great place to live.

DAVID TRACHTENBERG EXPLORES THE "REAGAN DEFENSE BUILDUP"

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the term "Reagan defense buildup" has been repeated so many times that it has become an article of faith. In fact, the term is more rightly viewed as an oxymoron. Due to a variety of factors, not the least of which is congressional opposition, the Reagan defense modernization pro-

gram has become a mere shadow of its former self.

The evidence for this claim is conveniently assembled and convincingly presented in the following article by David Trachtenberg of the Committee on the Present Danger. As Mr. Trachtenberg demonstrates, the Strategic Modernization Program has been virtually checkmated by continued Soviet strategic modernization, while the Soviet/Warsaw Pact conventional forces continue to expand at an alarming rate.

In response to this grim prognosis, the Congress returned the defense budget to a negative growth rate for 1986 and appears poised to compound the error in 1987. If "unilateral attrition" is to be our national defense policy, let the proponents of this policy state it openly, as they attempt to refute Mr. Trachtenberg's arguments.

WHAT REAGAN BUILDUP?

During the 1984 presidential campaign, the Reagan Administration naturally chose to emphasize the successes rather than the shortcomings of its defense program. It was only after the election that the Administration's rhetoric on defense shifted toward a more sober assessment of the U.S. Soviet military balance. Nevertheless, the damage has been done and the myth of a massive Reagan defense buildup has proved difficult to dislodge.

For starters, consider the area of defense spending, which is the only part of the federal budget determined by external factors: the nation's domestic priorities can be set and changed by Americans; the Soviet threat can not. Contrary to common belief, during the Reagan years there's been an overall decline in the growth of U.S. defense budget authority (the amount appropriated for immediate and future disbursement). The largest annual rate of real growth over the past ten years (more than 12 percent) was in fiscal year 1981—the final year of the Carter Administration! Thereafter, with one exception, the rate of real growth in defense budget authority declined—from 11.8 percent in 1982 to 7.6 percent in 1983 and to 4.4 percent in 1984. After an increase to 5.9 percent growth in 1985, fiscal year 1986 budget authority actually declined by 6.2 percent. This is the first time in fifteen years that defense budget authority is lower in absolute terms than in the previous year.

In part, these cuts have come about because of Congress's concern with the size of the federal budget deficit and with reports of Pentagon "waste." The relationship of defense to the deficit, however, is widely misunderstood. As a percentage of the federal budget, defense spending accounts for only one quarter of expenditures—down from one-third in the early 1970s—yet it has absorbed a disproportionate share of spending cuts.

And while tales of Pentagon procurement "horror stories" have fostered a belief that much of the money spent on defense is wasted, of greater importance to U.S. security is the less publicized fact that more efficient production rates have reduced the unit costs of weapons systems. Some of these systems actually cost less today in real terms than they did four or five years ago. The annual growth rate in the cost of major weapons systems fell from 14 percent in 1980 to less than 1 percent in 1984. Nevertheless, Americans seem to be more familiar with stories of over-priced hammers than with the fact that the B-1B bomber is being delivered on schedule and *under budget*.

A sound defense cannot be obtained "on the cheap," yet just over 6 percent of the nation's economic output goes for defense, hardly a disproportionate share. (An estimated 15-17 percent of Soviet GNP goes to military purposes.) While the Reagan Administration has been accused of favoring strategic over conventional forces, the percentage of defense resources allocated to strategic forces has changed little since the Carter Administration—less than 15 percent of the defense budget, another fact that is not widely known.

Moreover, most Americans erroneously think that the United States spends several times as much on nuclear forces as on non-nuclear forces, and they are unaware that in the past ten years the Soviets have outspent the United States on strategic forces by a margin greater than three to one. Significantly, the Soviets spend only about 10 percent of their military budget on personnel costs. The rest goes for weapons, equipment, and facilities. The United States, by contrast, spends almost half of its defense budget on personnel. This is one reason why Soviet military production levels far exceed U.S. levels.

In the critical area of military investments (spending on research and development, procurement, and military construction), the Soviets have outspent the United States by some \$500 billion since 1970. It is the cumulative effect of this gap in investment which has led to the major military imbalances that grow more critical every year.

The most striking deficiency of the Administration's defense program has been its inability to restore the strategic nuclear balance. This is the fulcrum on which all other military power rests—a fact the Soviets have consistently recognized.

To its credit, the Administration is seeking to modernize all components of U.S. strategic nuclear forces. The problem is that most of these improvements are years—and in critical cases, many years—from fruition. In the meantime, little emphasis has been placed on reducing existing U.S. strategic force vulnerabilities—particularly ICBM vulnerability.

Today, the increasing accuracy of Soviet ICBM's has left U.S. ICBM's dangerously open to a Soviet strike. The Air Force has repeatedly told Congress that "using a small portion of their ICBM force, the Soviets could destroy most of our current ICBM's in a first-strike." Secretary Weinberger has said that at least 95 percent of U.S. ICBM's are vulnerable to Soviet attack. Such an attack would leave the United States with an inaccurate sea-based force incapable of retaliating against Soviet missile forces held in reserve, and a greatly diminished bomber force unable to retaliate promptly and unlikely to penetrate the extensive Soviet air defense network.

How ironic that an administration which entered office proclaiming that a remedy to the ICBM vulnerability problem was its most urgent strategic priority has now ruled out the only near-term options for accomplishing that task—more survivable basing and a vigorous strategic defense program. The MX ICBM, originally designed to be mobile and therefore more survivable than current U.S. Minuteman ICBM's, is now being deployed in the same fixed Minuteman silos the Administration admits are already vulnerable to Soviet attack. Although the technology for hardening silos to protect them against nuclear blast effects appears promising, there are no plans to harden any of the silos that will house the

fifty MX missiles whose deployment has recently begun. This will leave the MX missile force just as vulnerable to attack as the current Minuteman missiles the MX is designed to replace, while presenting the Soviets with a greater incentive to strike first in a crisis.

Existing technology makes it possible to deploy a timely and effective ballistic missile defense of U.S. ICBM's—unlike the current Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) which focuses on exotic technologies that are many years, if not decades, from realization. Such a deployment, however, would violate the ABM treaty, something the Administration has not yet decided to do (even though it protests that the Soviets have already done so).

Eventual deployment of a more survivable Midgetman missile is uncertain because of the Administration's lukewarm support of the program. Some argue that the Midgetman will be too costly to build and too difficult to deploy, or that it will be too difficult to verify under an arms control agreement. Others believe it will undercut the Administration's push for another fifty MX missiles, even though Congress is unlikely to appropriate funds for additional MX deployment. The latest U.S. arms control proposal, which calls for a ban on all mobile ICBM's, inspires little confidence that mobile missiles will ever be deployed by the United States. By offering to give up the Midgetman, the Administration has clearly indicated it would rather not spend limited resources on this program. Congress may agree.

But the problem again is that in strategic systems, as elsewhere, the United States has not kept pace with Soviet efforts. While the United States debates the merits of fifty MX missiles, the Soviets complement their already huge ICBM force by deploying modern SS-24 and SS-25 missiles. The CIA has reportedly concluded that Soviet ICBM production over the next five years will "increase substantially," compared with the last five years.

To date, the United States has deployed only seven Trident submarines. Although the Tridents carry more missiles than the older Poseidon submarines, they do not offset the greater number of U.S. launch platforms removed from service in recent years. To make way for the newest Trident last year, the United States dismantled a Poseidon submarine in order to comply with the unratified SALT II treaty, which the Soviets are violating. And in May the President ordered two more Poseidons dismantled (although he declared his intention to add to U.S. strategic forces later this year "without dismantling additional U.S. systems as compensation under the terms of the SALT II Treaty").

In intercontinental bombers a once-heralded U.S. advantage has now disappeared. The Soviets today possess some 450 bombers compared with 327 for the United States. The planned procurement of U.S. air-launched cruise missiles has been cut by more than half, while work continues on an advanced cruise missile for future deployment. The limited deployment of cruise missiles on B-52 bombers, begun in 1982, does not reduce the vulnerability of those bombers to Soviet attack since most are deployed too close to U.S. coasts and only a small fraction are on stand-by alert.

Recent figures indicate that the Soviets continue to outproduce the United States in every major category of strategic systems. For example, last year alone the Soviets

produced 100 ICBMs, compared with none for the U.S.; 100 SLBMs, compared with our 75; and 50 bombers, compared with only two for the United States. In addition, the latest intelligence estimate jointly presented to Congress by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency notes that over the past ten years, "Soviet strategic forces received roughly 3,500 ICBMs and SLBMs, three times as much as the United States procured." These trends can be expected to continue, even if the Administration's defense request had been approved by Congress.

The balance in European-based nuclear forces has also continued to shift in the Soviets' favor. The eventual deployment of 108 U.S. Pershing II ballistic missiles and 464 ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs) is more than offset by already deployed Soviet SS-20 missiles, carrying more than 2,000 warheads, and the reduction in other U.S. European-based systems. The United States continues to phase out older tactical nuclear weapons from the NATO stockpile. Approximately 1,400 U.S. nuclear weapons are to be withdrawn from Europe by 1989, bringing the NATO stockpile of warheads down to its lowest level in twenty years. The United States is withdrawing five warheads for every Pershing II and GLCM warhead deployed in Europe.

Against these reductions, Soviet shorter-range nuclear weapons targeted against Western Europe have grown in number and accuracy. A fraction of Soviet SS-21, SS-22, and SS-23 ballistic missiles are capable of destroying almost every one of NATO's critical military installations. Estimates show the Soviets now enjoy at least a six-to-one advantage in shorter-range tactical ballistic missile launchers deployed in Europe.

The greatest gains in U.S. deterrent strength over the past five years have come in the area of conventional forces. Force readiness has improved, the quality of enlistees is up, and the replacement of older equipment with newer, more sophisticated systems is continuing. By most assessments, the conventional war-fighting capability of the U.S. armed forces is better today than five years ago. In any conflict, however, the U.S. forces of today will not be fighting the U.S. forces of five years ago. They will be fighting Soviet forces, which have also modernized extensively. From 1980 to 1984, the Soviets deployed about 80 new weapons systems—twice the number deployed by the United States. In the face of a determined Soviet effort, U.S. improvements remain inadequate to make up for almost two decades of neglect.

Given the unexpected qualitative improvements to Soviet conventional forces, the U.S. deterrent capability in Europe is declining. According to recent Army testimony, the U.S. modernization program has been matched by a Soviet program that has "moved more aggressively than any of our estimates predicted. They have increased their numerical advantage more than expected, and, more alarming, have reduced and, in some cases, reversed, the qualitative advantage we held. . . . By many of the measures which we have used to compare our forces, we have indeed lost ground."

In conventional forces, the United States continues to be outproduced in many critical areas. A comparison of weapons systems produced in 1985 shows the following:

	U.S.	U.S.S.R.
Fixed-wing combat aircraft	320	700
Rotary-wing aircraft	235	550
Attack helicopters	50	250
Other military helicopters	185	300
Tanks	1,375	2,700
Other armored vehicles	1,700	3,500
Infantry combat vehicles	655	2,500
Artillery, mortars, rocket launchers	330	4,100
Antiaircraft artillery	25	100
Major surface combatants	8	8
Amphibious ships	2	2
Attack submarines	3	6

U.S. budgetary constraints threaten not only to halt progress in improving our military capability but also to overturn some of the gains made in the last few years. Cuts in the defense budget will in all probability affect the readiness and capability of U.S. conventional forces first.

Other nations look to the United States to counterbalance the growth of Soviet military power. If the United States fails to exercise this responsibility, there is no other nation, or coalition of nations, that is capable of filling the void. A defense program that will not halt the unfavorable trends in the U.S.-Soviet military balance, let alone reverse them, is not a defense program.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE EDWIN BEACH

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to California Appellate Court Judge Edwin Beach of Santa Paula, CA, who is retiring after faithfully and skillfully serving within the State of California as a member of the judiciary. For 27 years, Edwin Beach has served at every level of court in California, excluding the Supreme Court, to which he was assigned temporary duty by then-Gov. Ronald Reagan.

A self-proclaimed conservative justice, Mr. Beach believes, "judges should not make the law nor stretch it to fit their own views of what law should be. Judges should take the point of view that all branches of government should leave the private citizen alone, just so long as he or she doesn't interfere with the freedom of others." In defense of the private citizen, Mr. Beach has commented that the American style of attempting to evaluate the potential bias of jurors is ridiculous. Moreover Mr. Beach believes that the courts should not ask people questions concerning their particular philosophy because, "it is really none of the court's business."

In sum, the citizens of California will miss the service of Edwin Beach who has defended the rights of private citizens and the laws of his state. I would like to congratulate Justice Beach and wish him success in his future endeavors.

CYPRUS AMBASSADOR ADDRESSES AHEPA CONVENTION ON CYPRUS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Cyprus has entered its 12th year of brutal occupation and division by Turkish armies and hope for a solution has become dimmer as time progresses. While Greek Cypriots continue to live in fear of further invasion from the north, while the island continues to be partitioned barring communication and access to either side, while the people of Cyprus continue to hope for a solution to this unacceptable state of affairs, we in the Congress must continue to work toward a solution and continue to encourage commitment to resolving this situation.

In recent years, various proposals have been offered only to be rejected because they did not address the fundamental question that is being posed by the forced occupation of Cyprus. The centerpiece of any solution must call for the removal of foreign occupying forces from Cyprus. Any solution that does not include the removal of troops does not address the fundamental concern of the Greek Cypriots and the international community. Recently, the Cyprus Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable A.J. Jacovides, addressed the 64th Annual Convention of the Order of AHEPA in Miami, FL. He stressed to this distinguished group of Greek-Americans the importance of continuous concern and involvement in seeking solutions. I wanted to share with my colleagues the text of the Ambassador's insightful speech:

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR A.J. JACOVIDES

I am honored and delighted to be with you once again. This is the sixth time that I have the privilege of addressing your Annual Convention and I feel that I am among good and trusted friends. I know, and very much appreciate, that these feelings are genuinely reciprocated by you.

I also feel privileged to be sharing this dais with many distinguished Hellenes, including Helen Boosalis and Nick Veliotis whose achievements and contribution to public service make us all feel proud of our heritage.

I bring you the warm greeting and best wishes of President Spyros Kyprianou for the success of this Convention and for the progress and prosperity of the great Greek American community. He asked me to convey to all of you—and especially the Supreme President and Lodge, the Chairman and members of the Committee on Cyprus and Hellenic Affairs as well as the Executive Director and his staff—the deep gratitude of the Government and people of Cyprus for all you have been doing to promote our just cause.

As I look around this great room, I see that this is a magnificent setting. It is of course right and proper that the Convention has many social, entertainment and sporting events. It is natural that here in Miami, in August, in these opulent surroundings, with many friends and relatives around, it is not easy to focus on pressing realities several thousand miles away. I wish

I were able to make a joke or two, to say something pleasant and amusing and join in the relaxed atmosphere of the balmy Florida summer evening.

Unfortunately, I cannot. As the Ambassador of Cyprus in this great country, I am allowed no such luxury. Instead, I must remind you of certain gruesome realities and ask for your continued and intensified efforts to help us in our struggle so that justice will prevail.

For twelve long years now—twelve years too long—the Turkish Attila illegally occupies much of our homeland; the refugees are still denied the inalienable right to return to their ancestral homes; the missing persons are yet to be found; colonists from Anatolia are still settled in the homes and lands of the forcibly uprooted Greek Cypriots. And the systematic effort to obliterate our national and religious heritage from the occupied areas and to legitimize the results of the invasion is being relentlessly pursued by Turkey, with the help or tolerance of those who misguidedly try to accommodate her designs for the sale of ephemeral and questionable expediency.

Justice, freedom, the respect of human rights and the rule of law, these are the very principles at stake in the extremely difficult situation we are currently confronted with.

The Cyprus problem, in its true dimensions of Turkish aggression, occupation, massive violation of human rights and attempted secession, is at a critical phase.

Recently, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty, where AHEPA so creditably participated, many beautiful words were spoken of freedom as an American ideal—and rightly so. But, the torch of liberty should be shining bright not only in New York's harbour but for all people who love freedom everywhere in the world, including our martyred island.

Actions speak louder than words. What we need to see is effective action to curb and remove the Turkish Attila from Cyprus and thus cure the problem, not only expressions of interest and concern and occasional measures of containment and damage limitation. The so-called "strategic importance" of Turkey can be no excuse for inaction since it is beyond dispute that, in the final analysis, Turkey needs the United States more than the United States needs Turkey. Moreover, a just, fair and lasting compromise solution which we can accept, would be in the best interests of all the parties concerned, including the United States and even Turkey itself. For moral, legal and geopolitical reasons, we count upon the support of the United States, your adopted country, for effective help towards such a solution. The long suffering people of Cyprus fervently hope and trust that, with your help, they will not continue to be disappointed. By taking a determined stand in support of the cause of Cyprus, you would not only be doing your duty to your fellow Hellenes in Cyprus; you would also be acting as loyal American citizens in the best interests of the United States as a nation justly proud to be regarded as a nation of laws and a champion of freedom.

It was encouraging to hear Vice President Bush, at the recent Clergy-Laity Congress give the assurance in the presence of His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, of renewed efforts by the United States to help find a solution to the Cyprus problem. It is our hope that these efforts will be directed primarily towards Ankara where they are most needed, thus providing the necessary lever-

age towards the implementation of the U.N. resolutions on Cyprus—resolutions which the U.S. supported—as we have been urging all along.

It is only through the combination of U.N. good offices and mediation with effective and meaningful leverage on Ankara by the United States and other countries in a position to exercise such leverage, that the Cyprus problem can find a fair and lasting solution. The right framework for such a solution is clearly provided by the unanimous United Nations resolutions which are legally binding on all.

More recently—on 28 July 1986—Congressman William Broomfield, the ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in an important policy statement, urged U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar "to restudy his recent peace plan with the idea in mind of focusing on the Turkish troop issue." "The United Nations," he stressed, "must make the overall draft framework agreement more sensitive to the legitimate concerns and point of view of the Greek Cypriots." "Our Government," declared Congressman Broomfield, "must actively work with the United Nations in making future peace plans more realistic vis-a-vis the perspective of the Greek community on Cyprus. Our Government must make it perfectly clear, both to Secretary General de Cuellar and to the Turkish Government, that the first step in the peace process must involve the removal of the Turkish occupation troops."

Meanwhile, humanitarian aid to Cyprus is still necessary for refugee housing, schools and hospitals but also as a way of sending a political message of continuing caring and support by the American people. Very recently, we received an unpleasant surprise through the Administration's declared intention to reprogram, that is to say take away 12.35 million dollars from aid for the current year or 85% of the total amount which Congress earmarked for Cyprus refugee aid, in order to fund a different program.

This was unfair and unwarranted. If reprogramming was needed to meet other legitimate needs—and, of course, we are aware of the current fiscal constraints—the obvious candidate for it would be the enormous amount of aid given annually to Turkey. Remember that Cyprus would not have needed any aid if it were not for the Turkish brutal invasion that uprooted the refugees from their ancestral homes through the illegal use of American supplied weapons.

Remember also that massive U.S. aid—your tax dollars—in effect subsidizes the illegal Turkish occupation of Cyprus. Recently, it was admitted in official Turkish Central Bank figures that Turkey spends 800 dollars annually to subsidize each Turkish Cypriot; and this is in addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars which is the annual cost to Turkey for maintaining its illegal occupation army in Cyprus. No wonder this attempt to take away the bulk of the humanitarian aid voted and earmarked for Cyprus by Congress, has created a storm of protests in both the Senate and the House of Representatives and strongly worded letters objecting to it were written by the key members of the Senate and House Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees and by many other friends of Cyprus on Capitol Hill. The outcome is still uncertain and this is a matter which you, as American citizens and taxpayers, should know about. More than dollars and cents, it raises an issue of principle, as was rightly pointed out

in main editorials of the Greek American press and by several Greek American Organizations.

Our message to you is loud and clear: The omens are not good and we need all the political support we can get in our struggle to restore justice for Cyprus. The recent illegal visit of Prime Minister Ozal to the part of Cyprus occupied by the Attila troops, an act which has been rightly called "unwise" by the State Department and was unreservedly condemned both in Cyprus and abroad, his provocative statements while in Cyprus, the open threats uttered by Turkish generals against the Republic of Cyprus, the ominous recent increase of the Turkish occupation troops in number and American-supplied equipment and Denktash's latest arbitrary measures are all clear messages that what Turkey seeks is to impose her unacceptable terms and to bring about a solution to the Cyprus problem that will serve her ultimate expansionist objectives in the whole region.

Let me categorically state that we in Cyprus are determined neither to capitulate nor to surrender. Our firm stand, with the support of democratic Greece and Hellenism as a whole, is to pursue our course, with faith, dedication, and a sense of responsibility, in order to overcome the obstacles and to achieve a just and viable solution based on the unanimous and legally binding UN resolutions. If such a solution is reached, Cyprus has the human and economic resources and can indeed become, instead of a bone of contention, a bridge of peace and understanding in the Eastern Mediterranean region, for the benefit of all Cypriots and for peace in the area.

I thank you for your attention and for allowing me to take some of your time on matters which are not only of the utmost concern to your fellow Hellenes in Cyprus but dear to the hearts and minds of all right-thinking people everywhere. I trust you will agree that these are matters which you should be aware of and that you feel about them as strongly as I do.

Let me conclude by reminding you that when united and determined, Greeks, through the ages have performed miracles. Our pledge is not to rest until justice is restored to Cyprus. With your help, this can and will be done.

Thank you for your attention.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS UZZALINO

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Thomas Uzzalino upon his elevation to the executive vice-presidency of the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen.

Thomas Uzzalino has long been a dedicated leader of the labor union movement in New Jersey. From 1963 to 1975 he rose steadily in the ranks to assume even more important posts in the Bricklayers Local 23, the Bergen County Building Trades, and the Bergen County District Council of Bricklayers.

In 1975, Mr. Uzzalino left his post as president of the Bergen County Building Trades to assume the duties of the vice president of the

New Jersey State Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO.

In 1981, Mr. Uzzalino became the secretary-treasurer of the New Jersey State Building and Construction Trades Council.

During his tenure as president of the New Jersey State Conference of Bricklayers, Mr. Uzzalino exerted strong and effective leadership. He quickly became recognized as an outstanding leader and assumed the post of the international union special deputy, Bricklayers and Allied Crafts, in 1983.

Thomas Uzzalino married the former Patricia Hishon of Dumont, N.J. in 1957. They are the parents of four fine children: Joseph, Marie, Peter, and Patricia Ann.

I, therefore, take this opportunity to publicly recognize Mr. Uzzalino's many years of active concern and skillful leadership. I am confident that he will brilliantly fill the post of vice president of the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO CHARLES P. SLOCOMBE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Charles P. "Chuck" Slocombe on the occasion of a dinner to be held in his honor on October 3.

Chuck was born in 1907 and is a native of the San Francisco Bay area. He came to the Long Beach Harbor area in 1928 as an oilwell worker and teacher of Sunday school at Emmanuel Presbyterian Church. Soon afterward he became involved in organizing harbor cruises, which ultimately led to his many decades of important contributions to the southern California maritime community. During his early years on the harbor he was known as a seismologist searching for oil deposits off the coast, and as a skipper of sportfishing boats, pilot boats, and water taxis. During World War II, Chuck's knowledge of the harbor area proved valuable to U.S. Navy intelligence.

After the war, Chuck spent some 20 years in a variety of duties with Pacific Towboat. During this time he also worked to develop and operate Pierpoint Landing, one of the biggest waterfront tourist attractions in Long Beach. After leaving Pacific at age 65, Chuck helped Crowley Maritime Corp. to inaugurate their Catalina Island passenger service.

When Chuck took his second retirement 12 years later, he became cochairman of the Tall Ship Olympic Parade of Sail for the Los Angeles Olympics, which was witnessed by some 1.4 million people.

Chuck is also a Cetacean Society expert on whales and has given presentations on the subject to over 400,000 persons, including students and professionals. He is also an avid amateur radio operator. Most recently Chuck has been engaged in raising funds for an International Seafarer's Center for Long Beach, which has already been a huge success.

Chuck is a valuable asset to the Long Beach community and an inspiration to us all. My wife, Lee, joins me in honoring Chuck on this very special occasion. We would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him on his achievements and express our wishes for continued happiness for Chuck, his wife Ann, their daughters Sharon and Betty, their grandsons Dan and William, and their great-grandchildren Brett, Brian, Beverly, and Kelli.

ONE MAN'S WAR ON DRUGS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the personal contribution one young man is making in the continuing war against drugs.

A native Louisvillian, Gary Baker has embarked on a cross-country, marathon-style journey to carry a simple message to America's youth about the dangers of alcohol and drugs.

While we in Congress prepare to consider comprehensive legislation in the fight against illicit drugs, we should be mindful of the outstanding individual efforts that are helping to increase public awareness and the call for an all-out attack on this national scourge.

I commend to my colleagues the following newspaper article from the Courier-Journal about Gary Baker's remarkable quest. His dedication and sacrifice to this cause is deserving of our highest respect and admiration:

COAST-TO-COAST RUNNER TAKES STEPS TO FIGHT DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE

(By Tom Stone)

Twenty-eight days after he began his coast-to-coast marathon, Gary Baker ran across the Jefferson County line yesterday ahead of schedule, carrying a statement to youth that they should "Just Say No" to drugs and alcohol.

"This marathon is the culmination of a 10-year dream of mine to run across the United States," Baker said last night, resting at his parents' home in southern Louisville.

Baker, 40 started his transcontinental marathon in Virginia Beach, Va., on July 16. After walking and running 700 miles, he still has three months and 2,300 miles left before he reaches Los Angeles.

"It had always been a selfish idea, an ego trip," said Baker, a Louisville native. "but a few months ago, I began looking for a way to do it for a worthy cause."

Through all the places he travels—large cities and rural towns—he carries with him the message of the "Just Say No" Foundation, a national organization that tries to help youngsters resist peer pressure to use drugs and alcohol.

"The primary goal of the marathon is to encourage people to organize 'Just Say No' clubs," Baker said. These clubs are groups of youngsters, 7 to 14 years old, united in their commitment not to drink or use drugs.

The trip is costing Baker about \$6,000. He is also taking an expensive leave of absence from his job as a salesman at Standard Coffee Service Co. in Tennessee.

About \$2,000 was collected from small businesses in Nashville, Tenn., to help offset some of the expense, Baker said. Also, New Balance shoe company has donated running equipment to him, and Days Inn is providing free lodging at its motels along his route.

Baker's wife, Debbie, and their two children are staying at their home in the small town of Edgewood, Tenn., during most of the four-month marathon. But they're coming to Louisville tomorrow night to spend the weekend with him.

"I told her when we got married that I was going to do this," Baker said. The Bakers will celebrate their eighth anniversary two weeks after Baker expects to complete his marathon.

Baker said his encounters with drugs and alcohol and his observations of the damage they can do prompted him to support the "Just Say No" campaign.

He worked as a bartender while studying at the University of Hawaii, where he earned a bachelor's degree in health and physical education.

And he taught alternative courses in a Virginia high school, where he worked with potential dropouts, many of whom had problems with drugs and alcohol.

Baker plans to resume walking and running on Shelbyville Road near the Watterson Expressway at 10 a.m. today. He will travel west to Frankfort Avenue, then jog down Main Street to the Riverfront Plaza/Belvedere, where he will have a press conference at 11:30 a.m.

Until now the only mission of the marathon was to carry the message of the "Just Say No" Foundation and get new clubs started.

Beginning today, however, the marathon will also be part of a national fund-raising project to help finance "Just Say No" clubs in schools, Baker said.

The "Just Say No" foundation received a license Monday to operate as a non-profit organization and solicit donations, said Tom Adams, the foundation's director.

"We're asking people to match each mile he runs with a penny," Adams said. At a penny a mile, Baker's marathon would cost a contributor \$30.

For more information about starting a "Just Say No" club, call (800) 258-2766. Donations can be mailed to the foundation at 1777 North California Blvd., Suite 200, Walnut Creek, Calif. 94596.

Baker is also challenging people to show their commitment against drugs by running with him at the track at Fairdale High School from 6 to 7 p.m. Sunday.

He is a 1964 graduate of Fairdale, where he played football as a senior.

The toughest part of the marathon so far, Baker said, were the first five days. But after blisters on his feet turned into calluses, the running became easier.

Now his biggest challenge is not getting run over on winding two-lane highways, Baker said.

But despite 90-degree temperatures, occasional downpours and rough terrain, Baker said the marathon has been worth everything he's put into it.

"It's a dream come true," Baker said. "I'll never get a chance to do anything like this again."

APARTHEID

HON. CHARLES A. HAYES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, an historic event recently took place in the Republic of South Africa with the installation of Desmond Tutu as Anglican Archbishop of Capetown.

Archbishop Tutu, a steadfast advocate of peace and harmony, has been at the forefront in the struggle against the hideous system of apartheid. Unfortunately, the official policy of our Government toward apartheid has given the archbishop no assistance in his efforts to dismantle it.

There is a growing groundswell of American support for distancing the United States from the apartheid regime of the Republic of South Africa. This Chamber has already gone on record to impose stiff economic and trade sanctions against South Africa and the U.S. Senate has done likewise. Unfortunately, the Reagan administration has failed to see the writing on the wall and has steadfastly followed its policy of constructive engagement.

Mr. Speaker, the time is at hand that the U.S. Government disassociate itself, clearly and without reservation, from the system of apartheid. With that thought in mind, I would like to share with our colleagues a recent editorial published in the USA Today newspaper entitled, "It's futile, immoral to cling to apartheid."

The editorial follows:

IT'S FUTILE, IMMORAL TO CLING TO
APARTHEID

Is Washington deaf to South Africa's drumbeat of death?

Twenty-one states hear it.

They are selling off their South African investments. Why? They hope to pressure Pretoria to abandon apartheid—the immoral law that allows 5 million whites to subjugate 24 million blacks. Two weeks ago, California voted to sell \$11.4 billion in investments tied to South Africa.

Cities and colleges hear it, too. More than 70 U.S. cities and more than 100 colleges have voted to divest. Last week, Harvard had to cancel a fancy alumni dinner because of protests about its \$400 million in South African investment.

The states, cities, and campuses hope to undercut South Africa's economy. They don't want Pretoria to have one U.S. penny to spend on an obscene policy that has made blacks aliens in their own land.

The drumbeat of death has been pounding for two years. Since September 1984, 2,300 people have died protesting apartheid. Day after day—death after death. Listen:

Four blacks killed Sunday by police in Durban. Two killed Saturday in Port Elizabeth. Twenty killed in Soweto and their funeral desecrated by police hurling tear gas.

But in Washington, the official response to that drumbeat has been a minuet of missed opportunities.

Last Thursday, President Reagan refused to order tough sanctions. Instead, he extended for a year modest measures that even his aides admit were ineffective in pressuring white South Africa to share power with blacks.

Congress, meanwhile, is dancing around the issue and may run out of time. The

House wants a tough bill calling for all U.S. businesses to pull out within six months. The Senate has a milder bill to restrict new U.S. investments in South Africa. If a compromise is adopted, President Reagan may veto it. And Members of Congress will go home in October to campaign, whether it's enacted or not.

It would be outrageous if Congress failed to act on this great moral issue. It is not enough for just cities, states, and colleges to strike out at apartheid. Congress must pass the toughest sanctions possible. Congress must let the world know that it does not share the weak moral position of the White House.

It is time for the USA to make it crystal clear that we oppose apartheid, we oppose the government that invented it, and we will take strong steps to stop it.

Those who claim that South Africa should be left alone are deaf and blind to the inevitable: Unless apartheid is ended, South Africa will sink into a racial blood bath.

On Sunday, whites and blacks together sang Anglican hymns and African chants as Desmond Tutu was enthroned as Archbishop of Cape Town. This rare drumbeat of joy rang out for a man who says economic sanctions could save South Africa. We must listen to him.

Black South Africa is crying out for help. Oppressed blacks give their lives daily to fight apartheid, but all they ask of us is to close our pockets to their tormentors.

We must hear their pleas and end death's drumbeat.

STANLEY M. FISHER IS INDUCTED AS NEW PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues the installation of Stanley M. Fisher of Cleveland as president of the Federal Bar Association, headquartered here in Washington, DC. He will assume the presidency of that 15,000 member organization on October 1, 1986.

Stanley Fisher has been a leading member of the Cleveland legal community for more than three decades and is the first Ohio lawyer elected as president of the FBA. Currently of counsel to the Cleveland law firm of Arter & Hadden, Fisher was the first recipient of the Superior Service Award of the FBA Cleveland Chapter, and has twice received Distinguished Service Awards and Commendation Awards. A 1953 graduate of Oberlin College, Fisher earned his law degree at the University of Michigan Law School in 1950, and was a law clerk to Chief Judge Charles Simon of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, which sits in Cincinnati, OH. Since 1971, he has served as special counsel to the attorney general of Ohio, and has been an adjunct lecturer of law for the Cleveland Marshall School of Law.

Mr. Speaker, Stanley Fisher also serves as a national uniform law commissioner. He is a life member of the Judicial Conference of the Sixth Circuit and has been admitted to the bar

in Ohio, Michigan, and Florida. He has been an active member of the Federal Bar Association for more than 30 years and served as president of the Cleveland Chapter of the FBA in 1971-72 in addition to holding a number of national offices within the organization.

Mr. Fisher is also a member of the Bar Association of Greater Cleveland and the Cuyahoga County Bar Association and has served the Cleveland Bar as a trustee, and chairman of the professional ethics committee and Federal court committee and has served the Cuyahoga Bar as chairman of the American Bar Association, the American Association of Trial Lawyers, and the American Judicature Society. Stanley and wife, Elaine are the parents of four children, including Ohio State Senator Lee I. Fisher, an outstanding legislator and a personal friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my most sincere congratulations to Stanley M. Fisher on his election as president of the Federal Bar Association. I am confident that he will lead that organization capably and admirably and will work diligently to continue the fine tradition of that 65-year-old association.

SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH RALLY

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, older Americans from throughout our Nation gathered on the Capitol steps this afternoon to voice their concern about the Social Security notch situation.

As the representative of the highest concentration of Americans age 65 and over in our Nation, I certainly understand their concern about this inequity and have discussed this matter with thousands of my constituents. During the rally, I had an opportunity to meet with retirees from Florida to discuss the notch situation and its effect on all Social Security recipients born since 1917.

The notch is the result of the 1977 amendment to the Social Security Act which sought to correct an unintended flaw in the formula used to calculate Social Security benefits. This formula, enacted in 1972, seriously overcompensated for inflation, creating a situation where some beneficiaries, if the formula had not been changed, could, over time, have received Social Security benefits greater than their annual earnings before retirement. Actuaries projected that without a change in this formula, the Social Security trust funds quickly would have become insolvent.

Congress acted in 1977 to correct the flawed formula, but in doing so, established a new set of formulas which resulted in beneficiaries born in 1916 receiving proportionately larger Social Security checks than born in 1917 and after, even if the workers had almost similar lifetime earnings records. This discrepancy in benefits was dubbed the notch.

Before Congress can rectify the notch situation, we must fully understand the alternatives available to us and the cost associated with

each alternative. Legislation I have cosponsored would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Commissioner of Social Security to immediately prepare such a report to Congress.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which oversees funding of the Social Security Administration, I have discussed this matter with Social Security officials, and in answer to my questions during our hearings was told that the estimated cost of providing increased benefits to those affected by the notch would be \$82 billion through 1990.

Mr. Speaker, any solution to the notch problem should be one that is fair to Americans born in 1917 and after, but will not jeopardize the stability of the trust funds for all current and future retirees. Congress acted in a strong, bipartisan manner in 1983 to ensure the financial solvency of the Social Security system well into the next century. We must work together in a similar fashion to provide fairness to all beneficiaries, in a financially responsible manner.

IMPRESSIONS OF A VISIT TO THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, this past July, I had the opportunity to visit the Soviet Union with several members of my community. The visit left such a vivid impression on me and confirmed my views that we must continue to stress the importance of human rights and emigration in our dealings with the Soviets, that I issued a newsletter to my constituents to highlight for them my impressions of the visit. I wanted to share with my colleagues the text of my newsletter:

A VISIT TO THE SOVIET UNION

I recently visited the Soviet Union to explore bilateral issues of interest relating to trade, tourism, arms control and human rights accompanied by Michael Varbalow and Dr. Eugene Bass, President and Vice President of the Jewish Federation, Marcy Sanders, President of the Federation's Women's Division, Morton Jacobs, Past President of the Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC), and his wife Claire, and Alan Respler, Executive Director of the JCRC. The mission to the Soviet Union included meetings with Soviet trade and tourism officials, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Hartman and Consul General Charles Magee, and numerous Soviet refuseniks.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The most poignant part of this mission included meetings with individuals that have expressed the wish to emigrate but have been repeatedly refused and subjected to harassment for their desire to leave. These "refuseniks" are those who seek to exercise the human rights guaranteed to them by international accord including the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, the freedom of political thought and expression, and the freedom of movement and emigration. An application to emigrate immediately triggers the loss of the jobs, pervasive surveillance, harassment which becomes

commonplace, false criminal charges, trials of a sort and imprisonment.

I was able to meet with three of the 20 Divided Spouses, Svetlana Braun, Sonia Melnikova-Eichenvald, and Dimitri Vlasenkov. They come from different backgrounds—Ukrainian, Lithuanian and Armenian—and have married American spouses but are not permitted to join their spouses in the West. Their mail is often intercepted, they are harassed, followed, and beaten. The majority of the Jewish refuseniks I met with were highly educated professionals ranging from mathematicians to engineers that had undergone harassment and loss of status once they applied to emigrate. In Leningrad, refuseniks such as Aba Taratuta, a mathematician now working as a night watchman and elevator operator, Lev Shapiro, an electronics engineer now an electrician in an apartment building, and Mark Reznick, painted a disheartening picture of life as a refusenik. Despite this loss of status and the danger they face, they continue to practice their religious beliefs, teaching Hebrew to their children, organizing Jewish cultural events and festivals and stoically withstanding harassment by Soviet authorities. Harassment begins at an early age as 8 year-old Naomi Shapiro experienced when she was refused admission to the school her brother attests because her father, Lev, has applied to emigrate. Alexi Bronstein, the step-son of long-time refusenik Lev Bronstein who died in May, lives a life of constant obstacles as a medical student. Last year, his name appeared in an article associating him with an anti-Soviet underground movement and immediately, his grades dropped and he is in danger of being expelled. Eugene Gilbo, whose two academic degrees were stripped as he applied to emigrate, worked as an entrance examiner in the Leningrad Polytechnic Institute where he was told to give failing grades to exams submitted by Jewish applicants.

Harassment extends to inhumane treatment of refuseniks who need to leave to seek treatment of disease. I met with Inna Kitrosskaya-Meiman, Tatjana Kheifetz-Bogolmonaya, and Benjamin Charny, who were repeatedly denied exit visas. Their tragedy was further compounded when they were stricken by serious forms of cancer and underwent numerous operations and painful treatments that were not effective. They cannot leave the Soviet Union to seek further treatment.

Many of the refuseniks face imprisonment on false charges for requesting to leave. Anna Lifshitz awaits her husband, Vladimir's release from his three-year sentence to a labor camp 5,000 kilometers away. He was tried for writing to the West to protest the loss of his job and his son's loss of an educational opportunity because of his parents' status. His wife was barred from the courtroom and asked to testify against her husband. Valdamir Slepak and his wife, whose son now lives in Philadelphia, were sentenced to Siberia for having protested the denial of their emigration application. They served their sentences but have been waiting to leave since 1970.

One of the key threads that ran through all of the meetings with refuseniks was their feeling that the issue of emigration and family reunification is a matter that must be given high visibility and international attention. There was an acknowledgment that the Soviet government recognizes the existence of concern about human rights issues and this is a view that I share after having met with Soviet officials. It is important

that our government stress the importance of this issue with the Soviets and underscore the position that human rights concerns must be addressed in order for the two nations to have an economic relationship.

TRADE

As Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism, I met with Soviet officials from the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Moscow and Leningrad Chambers of Commerce and Industry. The Soviet Union could benefit from Western technology and trade as their inefficient economy has been devoted to a military build-up to the detriment of their primitive domestic economy. The Soviets have needs that can form a market for U.S. manufacturers in the areas of food processing—40% of their tomato crop rots before it gets to market—hotel management, energy development, communications, and construction. However, it is crucial to note that before the U.S. can have such meaningful exchanges, the Soviet authorities must address the many human rights and emigration concerns that are raised through the treatment of Soviet Jews, Ukrainians, Pentecostals and many groups that seek to retain their identity and their fundamental freedoms. The Jackson-Vanik trade mechanism which ties trade with the Soviet Union to progress in emigration and permits trade as emigration levels rise continues to play an important and necessary role in U.S.-Soviet relations.

TOURISM

U.S. tourism from the U.S. to the Soviet Union remains low at 55,000 visitors per year. A meeting with the Chairman of Intourist in Leningrad dealt with areas for improvement including better hotel construction and management, increased tours and facilities and the need to further exchanges and opportunities for discussion. Soviet officials were receptive but emphasized concern that the Soviet Union retain control over products of any joint ventures. Officials expressed awareness of obstacles to better trade and tourism including human rights concerns as well as a willingness to address these concerns while furthering an economic relationship.

ARMS CONTROL

The escalating arms race and the increasing slices of the budget that are devoted towards building a sophisticated arms arsenal in both countries was a topic of concern. Sophisticated advances in the defense area are paralleled with the primitiveness of the day-to-day life in the Soviet Union. The promise of a second summit meeting between the leaders of the two nations has sparked hope that an agreement can be reached and a strong desire in the U.S. Congress for not only a verifiable arms control agreement but a commitment to the previously negotiated agreements. This was evident in the August approval by the House of Representatives of a Defense Department Authorization bill, which contained provisions which advocated a mutual moratorium on nuclear tests, reduced funding for the Administration's Star Wars program, prohibited the use of funds for weapons that would violate U.S. compliance with the SALT II treaty, and continued the moratorium on chemical weapons.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM PALKO

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of William P. Palko, president of the Palko Engineering and Supply Co. of Garfield, N.J. Mr. Palko has an outstanding record of public service. He has contributed to the well being of his fellow citizens on the community, county, and State levels.

As president and trustee of the Garfield Boys Club, Mr. Palko was the driving force behind the swimming pool drive which has provided Garfield with one of the finest facilities in the United States.

From the directorship of the local YMCA to the chairmanship of the Passiac Valley United Way, Mr. Palko has served his community well. His interests have encompassed affirmative action compliance and the construction of day nursery facilities.

A graduate of Rutgers, the State university, Mr. Palko has found the time to remember his alma mater. As president of the Alumni Association of his fraternity, Mr. Palko spearheaded a drive for a substantial addition to his chapter house.

I honor Mr. Palko as the epitome of the concerned citizen. In every area which has touched his life, Mr. Palko has contributed his time, his resources, and his talent.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
DON G. GILL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a civic leader in my district, Don G. Gill. Don is being honored on October 23 aboard the *Queen Mary* by the Long Beach Community Services Development Corp. for his dedicated service to the community. This auspicious occasion gives me an opportunity to express my appreciation for his work in behalf of Long Beach and its environs.

A lifelong resident of Long Beach, Don began what would prove to be a long career of school and community service at an early age. Seizing opportunities for education and personal growth, he participated extensively in athletic, academic, and extracurricular endeavors. This was to be a pattern Don would continue throughout his life, continuing after his college graduation whereupon he plunged headlong into numerous community improvement projects and other civic-minded pursuits.

Don has undertaken, and succeeded in meeting, numerous challenges in the community arena for more than 40 years. He has held major leadership posts in the All-Western Band Review, the Kiwanis Club of Long Beach, the Economic Opportunities Commission, the Mayor's Commission on Human Affairs, the Congress for Community Progress, the Community Welfare Council, the Heart Fund, March of Dimes, California International

Sea Festival, and the United Way. He has also made significant contributions of time and energy to the Public Social Services Commission of Los Angeles County, to the new main library committee, the police and fire memorial trust, LBUSD elementary and secondary education committee, and the SAE Alumni Association. Moreover, Don has the distinction of being the only individual in Long Beach history to be president of both the junior chamber of commerce and the chamber of commerce. Clearly, Don's long list of accomplishments highlights the truly remarkable contribution he has made toward the betterment of our community.

My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our warmest congratulations to Don G. Gill on this special occasion. His many years of community service and civic duty are an inspiration to us all. We wish Don, his wife, Sandy, and their children, Kim, Alison, and Tony, all the best in the years ahead.

FARM CREDIT SYSTEM BOR-
ROWER INTEREST RATE
RELIEF ACT OF 1986

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation aimed at permitting the institutions of the Farm Credit System to establish competitive interest rates for their farmer, rancher, and cooperative borrowers. I am pleased to note that a bipartisan group of over 100 of my colleagues is joining me as sponsors of the Farm Credit System Borrower Interest Rate Relief Act of 1986.

For more than 50 years the Farm Credit System has been the largest and one of the most important and stable suppliers of credit to American agriculture. As our Nation's farmers and ranchers continue to suffer under the worst economic depression since the 1930's, the Farm Credit System today finds itself in serious financial difficulties as well. The reasons are simple and obvious: When agriculture producers don't make a profit, they are unable to service their debts.

Production credit associations [PCA's] and Federal land banks [FLB's] today are carrying more than \$7.5 billion in nonaccrual farm loans that are not considered fully collectible, and they hold another \$5 billion in other high risk loans. Even though repayments are not currently being made on most of these troubled loans, the Farm Credit System is continuing to bear the cost of servicing its obligations to investors who have purchased bonds to finance the System's past lending activities. In other words, while the System tries to practice forbearance with its borrowers, it nevertheless must meet its bills when they come due to the investing public.

The growing volume of troubled loans and continued deterioration of farmland values has finally caught up with the Farm Credit System. Last year, the System posted the largest annual loss of any financial institution in history, nearly \$2.7 billion. For the first 6 months of 1986, the System lost another \$968 million,

and there is little reason to believe this trend has yet to run its course.

To add to the System's problems, it is also experiencing a serious flight of its best borrowers away from its PCA's and FLB's to other lenders whose terms and conditions are more attractive and quicker to respond to the recent overall downward trend in interest rates. From a peak of over \$85 billion in total outstanding loans at the end of 1983, the System's loan volume has fallen to \$61.5 billion as of June 30, 1986, and it continues to decline day by day.

The System is losing too many of its profitable loans, but because of current Federal regulatory requirements it is prohibited from reducing its interest rates to more reasonable levels so it can compete for new loans and hold on to the customers it now has.

The facts are clear about what has happened to the wholesale cost of money over the past year. Five-year Treasury bills have dropped from 9.81 percent to 6.8 percent. Since August 1985, the prime rate has dropped from 9.5 percent to 7.5 percent. Home mortgage rates have fallen from an average of 12.41 percent to 10.5 percent. However, during this same period, the Farm Credit System's interest rates have only dropped an average of less than 1 percent.

Many System institutions have been seeking to lower their rates—but the System's regulator, the Farm Credit Administration [FCA], has consistently rejected, delayed, and limited any interest rate reductions. This needs to stop. My bill would simply allow the Farm Credit System to determine its own interest rates without the prior approval of Government regulators. Commercial banks are not required to seek prior approvals for their interest rates from the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the Comptroller of the Currency. System institutions should not have to submit to prior approval either.

Therefore, the legislation I am introducing addresses this problem head on:

First, it removes the System's regulator—the Farm Credit Administration—the routine authority to set interest rates charged by the institutions of the Farm Credit System.

Second, it prohibits the Farm Credit Administration from specifically requiring System institutions to charge rates which are higher than the rates available from other lenders in their geographic area in order to meet required capital levels.

Third, it prohibits the Farm Credit Administration from charging System banks with an "unsafe and unsound" business practice if they follow the good, sound business practice of establishing interest rates to their farmer, rancher, and cooperative customers based upon their marginal cost of funds, the credit-worthiness of their borrowers and the cost of servicing loans.

Last year, when the Congress acted to assist the Farm Credit System, our primary concern was to ensure that agriculture producers have access to adequate sources of credit at competitive rates. It is an irrefutable conclusion that the rates charged farmers today by commercial banks, savings and loan associations and insurance companies are

lower than rates which the System is being forced to maintain by its regulator. The System's rates are neither competitive nor reasonable, and we have an obligation to provide expeditious, constructive and corrective action.

Mr. Speaker, as I introduce this bipartisan legislation today, I am concerned that we not lose sight of the fact that the Farm Credit System is a group of institutions which Congress created more than a half century ago to ensure necessary credit for agriculture at reasonable rates in good as well as bad economic times.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that no financial regulator tries to save an ailing institution by requiring that it charge rates which are non-competitive. No regulator seeks to make an institution nonviable by running off its good borrowers.

Certainly the System has significant financial problems. Some might say that what I am proposing might even make those problems worse. However, I firmly believe that the System's financial problems are only compounded when farmer after farmer is driven away from the System by unreasonably high interest rates. If the System should ever need direct Federal financial assistance, the cost of that assistance will be significantly higher if the System loses a valuable portion of its present paying customers.

The FCA has already begun its attack on this bill, insisting that it removes the regulatory tools necessary to ensure safe and sound operation of the System.

However, there is a major difference between permitting a commercial lending institution the right to set its interest rates to be competitive and the implication that this action is irresponsible and questionable under safety and soundness principles. There is only one provision of this legislation which addresses safety and soundness and that is only with respect to setting interest rates.

In fact, there are numerous other enforcement authorities which already exist in the Farm Credit Act and are readily available to the Farm Credit Administration.

This legislation does nothing to prevent the FCA from exercising its enforcement authorities to cure bad lending or management practices, inadequate loan documentation or the providing of credit without sufficient resources.

If the FCA believes that Farm Credit System institutions are poorly managed, they have sufficient regulatory authorities at this time to demand corrective action and/or remove management and boards of directors.

The Farm Credit Administration implies that the removal of their authority to regulate interest rates means that their powers to set capital requirements are eliminated. That's simply not true. The Farm Credit Administration continues to have the authority to establish minimum capital requirements for each institution. However, it does not give the FCA the power to require minimum capital by maintaining uncompetitive, excessively high interest rates.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a letter from the president and chief executive officer of the Farm Credit Corporation of America addressing the criticisms already raised by the Farm Credit Administration.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION
OF AMERICA.
September 10, 1986.

Hon. ED JONES,
Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee on
Conservation, Credit and Rural Development,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have studied the arguments being made by Farm Credit Administration (FCA) in opposition to your legislative initiative to allow the Farm Credit System to charge competitive rates. FCA appears to base its concerns on the "safety and soundness" issue and the "dissipation of capital" issue.

Unfortunately, there are hundreds of banks and savings and loans in this country which are also currently facing serious financial problems. I am not aware of a single case where a federal regulator, other than FCA, has required a weak institution to charge rates above competitive levels under the guise of "safety and soundness" or as a means of "preserving capital".

As director of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC) during the turbulent period of 1981-1983, I participated in the merger or liquidation of hundreds of weak financial institutions. It was never seriously considered to compel those institutions to raise their mortgage rates above competitive levels. Such a strategy would have been folly.

The Farm Credit System is making every effort to avoid the need for federal financial assistance. However, without the ability to charge competitive rates, the System has virtually no chance of recovery.

As the enclosed Press Release dated April 9, 1986, indicates, "The Farm Credit System must have the flexibility to change its prices in response to daily changes in the marketplace in order to serve its borrowers and manage its business as a successful institution."

On behalf of the Farm Credit System, I urge you and your colleagues to pass legislation which removes FCA from the business of approving interest rates. This will help the American farmer and improve the ability of the Farm Credit System to maintain its market share and to manage its assets and liabilities.

Sincerely,

H. BRENT BEESLEY,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. Speaker, I am the first person to insist that Farm Credit System institutions have made management mistakes and public relations blunders in the past and they probably will make others in the future. I've probably had more blunt, heart-to-heart discussions with the System's leadership about the mistakes they have made than anyone else in this country, including the regulatory officials of the Farm Credit Administration. However, punishing the farmers and ranchers of the country by forcing PCA's and FLB's to charge unreasonable interest rates is not an appropriate solution.

We have a clear choice. If we choose to take the positive action to give the System the opportunity to set rates competitively, there is good reason to believe that farmers and ranchers who have supported the Farm Credit System in the past will return and support it again. If we choose to turn our backs on this opportunity to be constructive, borrower flight will continue and it is reasonable to believe

that the Farm Credit System's financial base will continue to be weakened.

The result of such a weakening of the System will be that any future financial assistance necessary to aid the System will only be greater if we allow good customers to be driven away by excessive interest rates.

TRIBUTE TO BEN LEAL

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the impressive contributions to the American labor movement of a San Francisco Bay Area labor leader, Ben Leal.

Mr. Leal, who has been a Teamster for more than 40 years, will be recognized later this month at a dinner in his honor where he will receive the prestigious Menorah Award, presented by Histadrut, the State of Israel's General Federation of Labor. This honor is well deserved.

Ben Leal, a Navy veteran of World War II, began his union service in 1946 in Seattle, WA. While on the executive board of Seattle local 117 he earned a degree in industrial relations from Seattle University. He moved to the San Francisco area in 1950 and became president of Teamsters Local 241 4 years later. In 1956 he joined Teamsters Local 856 of San Francisco where he now serves as the chief executive officer.

This dedicated man today serves in a variety of capacities in the Western Conference of Teamsters, as an international trustee, and as president of the Northern California United Food and Drug Council which is comprised of 70 unions involved in the food industry. Ben Leal is a model citizen and deserves our warm congratulations on the significant occasion of his receiving this major award. His contributions to labor and his brothers and sisters in the labor movement are indeed immense.

TRIBUTE TO JOEL SCOTT

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer, the veterans of Georgia and our Nation lost a man who had worked tirelessly to secure their well-deserved benefits. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the accomplishments of Joel E. Scott of Cartersville, GA.

Joel Scott, who died July 14, was manager of the Cartersville office of the Georgia Department of Veterans Services. He also was extensively involved in the activities of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Scott was a World War II Navy veteran. He had served on the Veterans' Administration Rehab Committee since 1970, and at one time was vice president of that committee. He was the veterans representative on the deans

committee at Emory University Hospital in Atlanta.

In the American Legion, Mr. Scott was adjutant and service officer of Cartersville Post 42. He had served as service officer and past commander of the seventh district American Legion.

Mr. Scott served the National American Legion, including work on the Economic Commission of the Veterans Preference Committee.

In addition, Mr. Scott was an active Mason and Shriner, and served in many capacities at Cartersville Tabernacle Baptist Church.

Joel Scott will be long remembered for his contributions to the well-being of our veterans. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our sympathy to Mr. Scott's wife, Eulin, to his son, Ricky, and his grandchildren, Brian and Jo El, and to his mother, Mrs. Lois Scott.

SUPPORTING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND THE 3-YEAR RECOVERY RULE

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this House will soon be considering the conference committee's tax reform bill. I strongly support fair and equitable tax reform. And the conference committee's tax bill will be a step in that direction. But Mr. Speaker, as presently proposed the conference agreement has at least one very serious flaw.

This conference committee bill repeals the 3-year recovery rule. That rule provided that Federal employees who contributed to their retirement plans could, within the first 3 years after they retire, recover up front their contribution to that plan. Since they had paid tax on the money for that contribution when it first was earned, they would not be taxed again on their recovered contribution.

Many, many Federal employees planned their retirement believing that for the first 3 years, they could live on their recovered contribution without once again paying taxes on that money.

Time after time, this Government has attacked our hard working Federal employees. These employees are the government. They are the people who have helped to make America the great country it is today. This Government has asked them to make great sacrifices, and they have. In return, this administration has RIF'd them, cut their benefits, wreaked havoc with their retirement plans, replaced them with more expensive contract workers, and kept their salaries and their pay increases well below the salaries of workers in the private sector. Mr. Speaker, this Government has done just about everything possible to tarnish the prestige and honor that once went with dedicating one's life to public service, working for our Federal Government. And yet these dedicated and skilled Americans have persisted in their civic-minded commitment to America and its Government.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again.

When the repeal of the 3-year recovery first was proposed in the House, I opposed it. I

spoke to the members of the Ways and Means Committee and told them how unfair I felt repeal would be. I worked with other Members of the House to try to protect the Federal employee and to keep the 3-year recovery rule.

When that effort failed in the House, I wrote to Senator PACKWOOD. I said,

It is not fair to penalize—through new tax rules—the pension plans of police officers, teachers, FBI agents, Social Security workers and others who are already making tremendous contributions to our society through the work they do every day.

Mr. Speaker, fairness and equity must be the guiding principles behind our tax reform efforts. But in Congress' rush to pass tax reform legislation, it has lost its way, it has failed to follow its guiding principles.

It is unfair for Congress to make retroactive changes in the tax law. Mr. Speaker, when we pass tax laws, the rules of the game, the American people rely on the laws to plan their retirement. It is unfair for us to tell the American people that they can rely on these rules and to now change the rules of the game after the American people have begun to play.

And it is inequitable for us to ask, in the name of revenue neutrality, that loyal Federal employees shoulder an unfair tax burden so that other groups can keep their special tax breaks.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today not to oppose fair and equitable tax reform, but to oppose the unfair and inequitable repeal of the 3-year recovery rule.

STOP TRADE PREFERENCES FOR CHILE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as the 13th anniversary of General Pinochet's takeover of the Government of Chile approaches tomorrow, the level of repression and violence is once again escalating.

A member of the political opposition, José Carrasco, was dragged from his home in the middle of Sunday night. When his body was found, there were so many bullet holes in his head that he was almost unrecognizable. Two other similar killings were reported and the state security forces are the prime suspects in all three brutal murders.

A state of siege has been imposed by General Pinochet. Nationwide, people are being detained. Opposition press is being shut down.

We need to protest these actions by the Chilean Government. We need to take action against the continued outrages of General Pinochet.

At a minimum, Mr. Speaker, we need to enact legislation I have introduced to deny Chile preferential trade tariff treatment under the generalized system of preferences. There must be no reward for the murder, torture, and political repression of the totalitarian rule of the Pinochet regime in Chile.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PURCHASING MANAGEMENT

HON. JOHN McCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize and congratulate the National Association of Purchasing Management, and its 28,000 members located across the United States, for their foresight and effort in establishing the Center for Advanced Purchasing Studies [CAPS]. This center is the first privately funded purchasing/materials management research center in the country. It has two major goals: to improve purchasing effectiveness, and to improve the overall state of purchasing readiness.

These goals will be met by completing research in specific areas deemed having the greatest research payoff by purchasing executives across the country. The research results will help private industry become more effective, efficient, and competitive in the U.S. world marketplaces; as well as pointing the way to improved governmental purchasing practices, thus saving the taxpayer money.

The Center for Advanced Purchasing Studies is managed by the College of Business at Arizona State University, and is located at the Arizona State University Research Park in the 1985 all-American city of Tempe, about 5 miles south of the main Arizona State University campus.

The location of the Center for Advanced Purchasing Studies within the research park reflects the close cooperation that is emerging between industry, the university, and the professional purchasing association. This union serves as a bridge between the academic and business communities, to the long-term benefit of both.

SOCIAL SECURITY "NOTCH"

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the very important remarks of my good friend and constituent, Dr. Albert De Vito, on the subject of the inequities of the Social Security "notch" to the attention of my colleagues.

As the local leader of a grassroots movement, I believe Dr. De Vito's reasoning on this subject is germane to us all:

We of the Notch Generation, born 1917-21, have been hurt deeply by those of the past whom we elected to public office; hurt by those whom we recently elected and trusted to take care of our needs, which they negated. But yet, when it comes to handing out our money, taxpayers' money, it is given freely to other countries without a question of doubt. Need I go further on this subject? Those responsible only have to go into the depths of their conscious minds to understand this statement.

Let us look further. Our Nation today is No. 1 because of those who lived throughout

the Great Depression, lived at the birth of our Social Security law founded by the late and great Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and those who served on land, across all corners of the world, air and sea during World War II.

As we meet in D.C. today to state our case for H.R. 1917, let us look at the future positive results throughout the Nation. First of all, it will not rob the Social Security Trust Fund. It will appease the Notch Generation and those who come after.

Whenever a person receives money or assets, it always goes back into the Nation's economy. Industry will sell more products, build more structures to manufacture and house these products, and hire more people. More money will be paid into our tax structure. In fact, the money that will be taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund to pay us will be going back into that fund through FICA taxes. However in this, I would like to see the notch group receive credits beyond the age of 61.

It simply means that our Nation will be better off financially and the Notch Babies will be in a better state of mind being able to cope better with the High-Rise-Standard of living today.

Above all, my love, devotion and admiration go out to Mr. Roybal, all the congressmen who cosponsored his H.R. 1917 Bill, Mr. James Roosevelt and his "National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare," and the devoted Notch Leaders throughout the country I have had the honor of working with.

I say unto you, Blessed be with universal love.—Albert De Vito, GrassRoot Notch Leader, Westbury, NY.

TRIBUTE TO MARY JANE POWELL

HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the achievements of a constituent of mine, Mary Jane Powell. At their Dahlia Ball on Friday, September 12, the Merrimack Valley Democrats will honor Mary Jane by naming her "Democrat of the Year."

Mary Jane lives in Andover, MA, with her four children, Maren, Jenna, Jason, and Andrew, and her husband, Hank, with whom she cofounded and directs the Powell Corp., a small manufacturing company. The town of Andover and the surrounding community have benefited greatly from the activities of this diligent and selfless citizen.

A graduate of Merrimack College, Mary Jane has displayed a strong commitment to education. She expresses this commitment in a variety of ways: she holds a position on the board of trustees at the University of Lowell, and works as a learning disabilities tutor for the Reading Department of the Andover Public Schools. Mary Jane incorporates her dedication to education with that to women's issues by arranging speeches by career women for the students at St. Mary's High School in Lawrence. A former member of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Women's Issues, Mary Jane is particularly interested in women's economic issues.

Active in party politics, Mary Jane is an elected member of the Democratic State Committee in the Second Essex and Middlesex District. She has also done valuable work for several State officials.

Mary Jane has distinguished herself as a leader in her community through her work for a great number of public service organizations and programs. She is currently a member of the Andover Housing Authority and formerly served on the board of directors of the Bay State Skills Corp. Mary Jane Powell has made a substantial mark on her community through her tireless dedication to these and other such worthy organizations.

Through her selfless dedication to her party and her community, Mary Jane Powell has earned the respect and admiration of those fortunate enough to know her. It is my distinct pleasure to join my colleagues and the Merrimack Valley Democrats in honoring this active and productive citizen.

HONORING JOHN C. CHAVEZ

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to honor a beloved citizen, a devoted father, a hard worker, and a leader in his community: John C. Chavez of Pico Rivera, CA.

John is retiring from the City of Los Angeles Fire Department after 30 years of dedicated service. A dinner in his honor is planned for Friday, September 12, 1986.

John may be retiring from the fire department, I know from personal experience he will not be retiring from much else. He will continue to serve admirably on the Pico Rivera City Council, where he has been a member since 1978. He will continue to help with the Pico Boys' Baseball League. He will continue his extensive involvement in social services delivery, cities planning and State government affairs.

I have known John for many years now, and I have never known him to turn down someone who needed help. In Pico Rivera he is everywhere, making sure city services are delivered effectively and efficiently. He has served two terms as mayor. He understands that elected officials hold unique positions in the community: getting elected is a special honor that must be earned everyday through dedicated and responsible service.

John and I were students together at Stevenson Junior High School. I remember him during those times, which seems not so long ago, as a studious young man. Looking back I can see that John developed then the strong moral character that has been an inspiration to all of us who have lived and worked with John Chavez throughout these many years.

For John and Belen and their children, I know I have the support of my colleagues in the House of Representatives when I wish them all the very best in the coming years.

POLISH FALCONS OF AMERICA, GROUP 276, POLISH FALCONETTES AUXILIARY GROUP 883

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to your attention and that of our colleagues in the U.S. Congress, the 75th anniversary of the Polish Falcons of America, Group 276 and the 55th anniversary of the Women's Polish Falconettes Auxiliary Group 883 from Muskegon in our Ninth Congressional District of Michigan.

These organizations were originally established to promote the Polish culture, retain the Polish heritage and ease the transition of new immigrants to this country. Nest No. 276 was organized on March 13, 1911 in Muskegon. On June 11, 1911, the organization was admitted to the Polish Falcon Alliance. During World War I and II, many of the members of Group 276 joined the ranks of the Polish and American Armies in the United States, Canada and Europe.

The group has sponsored athletic teams, expanded greatly over the years, and throughout its history has been the leading organization in Muskegon's Polish community. The aim of Nest 276 continues to be a dedication to the physical, cultural, patriotic and moral advancement of its members.

The Falconettes Nest 883 of Muskegon was organized on April 17, 1931. Throughout its history, Nest No. 883 has participated in substantial fund raisings for the St. Michael's School, Catholic Central High School, and the Falcon Building. They continue to uphold the Falcon tradition and the high ideals of their organization.

This is just a brief look at the remarkable history of these outstanding organizations. There are many other achievements worthy of mention, but they all result in the same conclusion: these two nests continue to cherish their past culture while looking forward to the future of their country, America. They represent the best in what truly characterizes our Nation—hardworking, intelligent, God fearing and patriotic citizens.

DULUTH MIDDLE SCHOOL, A SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

HON. ED JENKINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 1986

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Friday, representatives from 272 schools from across the Nation will participate in a White House Schools of Excellence ceremony. One of those Schools of Excellence awards will go to Duluth Middle School in Gwinnett County, GA, located in my congressional district.

In a time when critics are looking for some particular group to blame for failures of the education system, I enjoy this privilege of pointing to a success. Since the criteria for

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

September 10, 1986

judging a school of excellence are the same for all, I am assuming you will find similarities among the schools. The selections are based on how well the schools used available resources; how well students' needs were met; school organization and goals; instructional programs; student achievement; school-community relations; and efforts at improvement.

Those who want to single out teachers or one other single group or factor to blame for failure of an education system should look at that selection criteria again and look specifically at those singled out as schools of excellence.

Let's look at Duluth Middle School. Let's start with the principal, Valerie Clark. That's where the parents and teachers were pointing when the award was announced. But Principal Clark quickly pointed her fingers back to the teachers, parents, students and other administrators in her school system.

She describes the teachers as "very dedicated and very enthusiastic," the students "as very special young people. They like the teachers. They're willing to do that little bit extra." She praises the community for its general support, pointing to a very active PTA. "The community just goes above and beyond to give us what we need."

She also spreads the credit to the school system's administration and her predecessor who planted the seeds for success. The fact that another Gwinnett County School was on last year's list of schools of excellence backs up her claim of the entire system being of good stock. Parkview High School in Lilburn was selected last year as one of the 260 Schools of Excellence.

I suspect you will find the cooperation evident at Duluth Middle School at all of the 272 educational institutions receiving this year's School of Excellence award. Let's all point our fingers of praise at them.

Duluth Middle School, I salute you. I salute your principal, your teachers, your students, your parents, and your community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 11, 1986, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 12

- 9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on tax reform.
2359 Rayburn Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up provisions of H.R. 5339, appropriating funds for fiscal year 1987 for foreign assistance and related programs (pending on House Calendar).
S-126, Capitol
- Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on applicable water law during the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's hydroelectric licensing proceedings.
SD-366
- Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on S. 2340, to provide a system of liability and compensation for oil spill damage and removal costs.
SD-406
- Select on Intelligence
Closed briefing on intelligence matters.
SH-219

SEPTEMBER 15

- 9:00 a.m.
Impeachment Trial Committee
To hold hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.
SR-325
- 9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To resume hearings on tax reform.
2359 Rayburn Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Armed Services
Military Construction Subcommittee
Closed business meeting, to mark up H.R. 1202, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 for carrying out wildlife, fish, game, and migratory game bird conservation programs on military reservations.
SR-222
- Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.
SR-325

SEPTEMBER 16

- 9:00 a.m.
Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.
SR-325
- 9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Foreign Agricultural Policy Subcommittee
To resume hearings to review United States food aid programs and efforts to help meet world food assistance requirements.
SR-332
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on S. 2565, to ensure the orderly and competitive de-

velopment of the telecommunications industry, and related proposals.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2781, to revise certain provisions of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to energy conservation standards for appliances.

SD-366

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2756, Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1986.

SD-342

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the Administration's proposed regional refugee admissions level for fiscal year 1987.

SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1987 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-192

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to mark up S. 2340, to provide a system of liability and compensation for oil spill damage and removal costs.

SD-406

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.
SR-325

SEPTEMBER 17

- 9:00 a.m.
Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.
SR-325
- 9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings on emerging criminal activity in Nigeria.
SD-342
- Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1203, to grant railroad police and private college or university police departments access to Federal criminal identification records.
SD-226
- 10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366
- 10:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on the financial condition of the farm credit system.
SR-332

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Sonia Landau, of New York, and R. Kenneth Towery, of Texas, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

SR-253

2:00 p.m.

Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.

SR-325

SEPTEMBER 18

9:00 a.m.

Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.

SR-325

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
To resume oversight hearings on the domestic and international petroleum situation.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 2340, to provide a system of liability and compensation for oil spill damage and removal costs.

SD-406

2:00 p.m.

Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.

SR-325

2:30 p.m.

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on certain provisions of S. 1352 (pending on Senate calendar), and H.R. 1202, bills authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 for conservation programs on military reservations and public lands, and S. 2741, to establish the Bayou Sauvage Urban National Refuge in Louisiana.

SD-406

SEPTEMBER 19

9:00 a.m.

Impeachment Trial Committee
To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.

SR-325

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the air quality within an airplane.

SR-253

Finance

Health Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine current Medicaid funding services provided for the long-term care of developmentally disabled persons.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.

Impeachment Trial Committee

To continue hearings on matters relating to the impeachment trial of the Honorable Harry E. Claiborne.

SR-325

SEPTEMBER 22

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review travel and tourism statistics.

SR-253

SEPTEMBER 23

9:00 a.m.

Office of Technology Assessment

The Board, to meet to consider pending business.

EF-100, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and the implementation of the Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1984.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2029 and H.R. 4090, bills to establish the Big Cypress National Preserve Addition in Florida, S. 2442 and H.R. 4811, bills to establish the San Pedro Reparian National Conservation Area in Arizona, H.R. 2921, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permanent easements for certain water conveyance systems in order to resolve title claims arising under acts repealed by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, S. 2707 and H.R. 2826, bills to designate a segment of the Horsepasture River in North Carolina as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

SD-366

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.

SD-106

SEPTEMBER 24

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review nuclear power safety measures in the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear power-plant accident.

SD-406

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 25

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the employment impact of United States/Japan auto-parts trade relations.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

SEPTEMBER 26

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

SR-253

SEPTEMBER 29

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1974 and S. 1113, bills to prohibit the imposition by States of the worldwide unitary method of taxation.

SD-215

OCTOBER 1

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

OCTOBER 2

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366